DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 998 UD 010 520

AUTHOR	North, Robert D.; And Others
TITLE	More Effective Schools Program in Poverty Area Schools, 1968-69. Evaluation Report of an ESEA Title I Project of the New York City Public School System.
INSTITUTION	Psychological Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Oct 69
NOTE	172p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.70
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement, After School Activities, Classroom Observation Techniques, College School Cooperation, Community Involvement, *Disadvantaged Youth, Interviews, Nonprofessional Personnel, Professional Personnel, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, School Integration, Special Education Teachers, Teacher Education, Teacher Qualifications, *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*More Effective Schools Program, New York City

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the fifth year of the More Effective Schools Program, this study utilized observations, interviews, central office and school records, and questionnaires administered to parents, teachers, specialists, students, and paraprofessionals for evaluation purposes. In this 1968-69 program, 1,422 teachers supplemented by 485 special teachers, 138 professionals, and a large number of paraprofessionals were deployed to teach 16,456 pupils living in New York City disadvantaged areas. The major objective of the program was to raise the academic achievement of the students by means of promising modern methods of teaching under optimum conditions with a staff of able, enthusiastic teachers and clinical teams. The program also included plans for selecting schools so as to achieve maximum integration, use of educational facilities after school hours, establishment of close relations with local colleges and universities, and increased community involvement in school matters. Findings of the study indicated that: the program's major objective was realized to a considerable degree--but many teachers through lack of training or experience seemed unable to make the most of opportunities presented; neither improved integration nor closer relations with colleges and universities was achieved; school facilities were used but not to the extent envisaged; and, most of the schools developed strong ties with the community. (RJ)

ED041998

TITLE: Evaluation Report for the Project, More Effective Schools Program in Poverty Area Schools, 1968-69

SUBMITTED TO: The New York City Board of Education

EVALUATING AGENCY: The Psychological Corporation, 304 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017, Tel.: 212-679-7070

INVESTIGATORS: Principal Investigator: Robert D. North, Ph.D., Associate Director, Professional Examinations Division, The Psychological Corporation

Co-Investigator: William R. Grieve, Ed.D., Consultant, The Psychological Corporation--Professor of Education, New York University, Washington Square, New York, N.Y. 10001

Co-Investigator: Gordon L. Madison, M.A., Research Associate, Professional Examinations Division, The Psychological Corporation

UD010520

TRANSMITTED BY: Robert D. North

DATE TRANSMITTED: October, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOREWORD

This is a summary of The Psychological Corporation's evaluation report for the New York City Board of Education project, "More Effective Schools Program in Poverty Area Schools," for the 1968-69 school year.

The senior members of The Psychological Corporation staff who had prime responsibility for conducting the evaluation study were Robert D. North and Gordon L. Madison. William R. Grieve, Bernice H. Fleiss, Buck R. Rex, and John W. McCarthy served as senior evaluation consultants. They participated extensively in the field observations and interviews, and helped to analyze the findings. Dr. Grieve headed this team of consultants. Gordon Campbell and Harriet Fields also provided consulting assistance in the field-work area. Staff members Emily A. Findlay and Bonnie M. Smyth provided additional professional assistance. David Loth contributed substantially to the preparation of the manuscript for this report. Jerome Rosenswaike was the editorial assistant.

The evaluators express their appreciation for the excellent co-operation they received from the Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education, the MES project director, and the staff members of the program and control schools that were involved in this study.

SYNOPSIS

During the fifth year of the More Effective Schools Program, 16,456 pupils living in disadvantaged New York City areas were enrolled in the 18 schools that are the subject of this report. Their 1,422 teachers--a teacher-pupil ratio considerably more favorable than the city average--were supplemented by 485 special teachers, 138 professionals in supportive ranks, and a substantially larger number of paraprofessionals than in most schools. The program's plan of abundant modern teaching materials and space sufficient to keep class size to 22 (15 in pre-kindergarten and 20 in kindergarten) was largely met.

The major objective of the plan was to raise the academic achievement of the pupils by means of promising modern teaching methods under optimum conditions with a staff of able, enthusiastic teachers and clinical teams. The plan also contemplated selecting schools so as to achieve maximum integration, the use of school plants after school hours, establishment of close relations with local colleges and universities, and increased community involvement in school matters.

For purposes of evaluation, all 18 ME schools were visited at least twice, as were 8 special service schools that served as controls. Evaluators made use of observations, interviews, central office and school records, and questionnaires filled out by parents, teachers, students, specialists, and paraprofessionals.

The program's major objective was realized to a considerable degree, especially in instilling in the pupils a desire for learning, a liking for school, and increased respect for themselves and others. However, many teachers, through lack of training or experience in the modern teaching techniques called for by this program of urban education, seemed unable to make the most of the opportunities offered by small classes, abundant materials, extra teaching help from specialists, and freedom from non-teaching duties. In the opinion of the evaluators, the children would have made even greater progress, especially in the basic skills of reading and arithmetic, if these defects in training could have been overcome.

Neither improved integration nor closer relations with local colleges and universities was achieved. School facilities were used fairly extensively after hours, but not as much as the MES planners envisaged. Most of the ME schools developed far stronger relations with the local community than did other city schools.

The evaluators strongly recommend continuation and expansion of the MES program. The suggestions they urge most strongly are directed toward teacher training in effective methods of teaching in these schools. The evaluators also offer proposals to enlarge the central staff, revise guidelines and procedures in certain respects, and reassess the matching of ME and control schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword i

Synopsis iii

List of Tables vii

Introduction xi

Section I--Description of the Program, Background, and Evaluation Plan

1. Description of the More Effective Schools Program 3

2. Main Findings of Previous Evaluation Studies 7

3. Evaluation Objectives, Design, and Procedures 17

Section II--Interview and Observation Findings in the ME Schools

4. Interview Findings 23

5. The Schools and the Community 37

6. The Instructional Program 47

7. Buildings, Facilities, Materials, and Supplies 59

Section III--Interview and Observation Findings in the Control Schools

8. Control Schools: Interview and Observation Findings 67

Section IV--Recorded Data, Test Results, Questionnaire Findings and Superintendents' Views

9. Recorded Data 81

10. Reading and Arithmetic Achievement as Measured by Standardized Tests 105

11. Questionnaire Survey Findings 117

12. District Superintendents' Views of the Program 135

Section V--Overall Evaluation, Summary and Recommendations

13. Overall Evaluation 139

14. Summary and Recommendations 157

Appendix--Questionnaires 165

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Average Class Size and Pupil-Teacher Ratio in Elementary Grades (1966 and 1968 Comparisons)	82
2.	Number of Students, Number of Classes, and Average Class Size--Grades 1-6--As of December 17, 1968	83
3.	Number of Students, Number of Classes, and Average Class Size--Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten Levels--As of December 17, 1968	84
4.	Expenditures for Salaries, Supplies and Equipment for Instruction Proper, ME Schools, School Years 1966-67 and 1968-69	86
5.	Expenditures for Salaries, Supplies and Equipment for Instruction Proper, Control Schools, School Years 1966-67 and 1968-69	87
6.	Average Register, Per Cent Attendance, Per Cent Pupil Mobility, ME and Control Schools, School Years 1965-66 and 1968-69	89
7.	Number of Years That 1968-69 Fifth-Grade Students Had Been in MES Program	90
8.	Percentages of Puerto Ricans, Negroes and Others in ME and Control Schools in December, 1968 as Compared With October, 1966	92
9.	Ethnic Backgrounds of Pupils on ME and Control School Registers (Percentages as of December, 1968)	93
10.	Percentages of Pupils With English-Language Difficulties in ME and Control Schools (As of December, 1968)	95
11.	Staff Positions in the More Effective Schools and Control Schools During Spring Term of 1968-69	97
12.	Percentage Distribution of Teachers' Years of Experience, ME and Control Schools, as of December, 1968	99
13.	Ethnic Composition of Staffs of ME and Control Schools as of March, 1969	101

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table — Page

14. Per Cent of Teacher Mobility in ME and Control Schools, School Years 1965-66 and 1968-69 — 102

15. Distribution of Observers' Ratings of Classroom Teachers' Administration of Standardized Tests in MES and Control Schools' Third-Grade and Fifth-Grade Classes--March, 1969 — 105

16. Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test for ME and Control School Students Tested in Both the Third and Fifth Grades (Spring, 1967 and Spring, 1969) — 110

17. Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on the Metropolitan Arithmetic Test for ME and Control School Students Tested in Both the Third and Fifth Grades (Spring, 1967 and Spring, 1969) — 111

18. Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on the Metropolitan Reading Tests for ME and Control School Students Tested in the Second Grade (Fall, 1965), Third Grade (Spring, 1967), and Fifth Grade (Spring, 1969) — 112

19. Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test of ME and Control School Students Tested in the Fifth Grade (Spring, 1967) and Also in the Seventh Grade in Junior High School (Spring, 1969) — 114

20. Percentage Distribution of Observers' Ratings of MES and Control Schools — 147

INTRODUCTION

The More Effective Schools (MES) Program of the New York City Board of Education was initiated in the fall of 1964 to carry out a new approach to the learning problems of young children in disadvantaged areas. The plan had been outlined by a joint committee composed of representatives from the staff of the Superintendent of Schools, the United Federation of Teachers, and the Council of Supervisory Associations.

The program began with 10 schools during the 1964-65 school year. Eleven more were added in the fall of 1965. Of these 21 schools, 18 are located in poverty areas and received 1968-69 financial support for the program through E.S.E.A. Title I funds. The participation of the other three ME schools during this school year was supported by special funds provided by the Board of Education.

During the last five years, an annual average of more than 15,000 children in the densest poverty areas of the city have attended the ME schools. The program has attracted a great deal of attention and has inspired an unusually large number of comments in both the professional and general press.

Since this 1968-69 evaluation study was conducted as an E.S.E.A. Title I program evaluation and received its financial support from Title I sources, its coverage is limited to the 18 Title I ME schools. These 18 schools are listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1

More Effective Schools Funded by E.S.E.A. Title I, 1968-69

	Manhattan	Bronx	Brooklyn	Queens	Richmond
	P.S. 11	P.S. 1	P.S. 41	P.S. 40	P.S. 18
	P.S. 83	P.S. 110	P.S. 80	P.S. 183	P.S. 31
	P.S. 100		P.S. 120		
	P.S. 146		P.S. 138		
	P.S. 154		P.S. 165		
	P.S. 168		P.S. 307		
Number of Schools	6	2	6	2	2

SECTION I

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM, BACKGROUND, AND EVALUATION PLAN

CHAPTER 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

The objectives and plans of the More Effective Schools (MES) Program were set forth in a Joint Planning Committee report that was published in May of 1964 (1).* This committee, consisting of representatives of the Superintendent's staff, the United Federation of Teachers, and the Council of Supervisory Associations, based the program plans on the following precept:

> New York City's tomorrow is being written in its classrooms today. There are too many children in our community who are growing up without the basic skills necessary for future success as citizens. We believe that these children, properly challenged and given the means for growth and learning, can make unprecedented academic and social progress. To meet this challenge a new design for education must be created.

In developing the MES Program plan, the committee invited the presentation of views by committee organizations, parents, civil rights groups, school staff members, and other professionals. Basic features of the plan, as well as underlying assumptions, are specified in the following excerpts from the introductory section of the committee's report:

> The plan recommends the utilization of every professional resource to insure success in school--the support of specialists in psychology and guidance, expert teachers of reading and the academic disciplines, the most skillful and effective supervisors and teachers available. The committee believes that nothing less than a comprehensive design can attain the goals of a meaningful, integrated education. Patchwork or limited improvements are futile. It is also recognized that the magnitude of initiating an effective school program is such that it can be started in September 1964 only in about ten schools. A timetable should be developed for its early extension to all the elementary schools.

The plan we submit makes several assumptions:

> More effective education demands that children of varied ethnic groups have the opportunity to grow together. Hence all plans for desegregation and better education must be linked. Successful education is essential to successful integration.

---

*References are listed at the end of the chapter.

All of the elements of a sound educational structure must be present. No one element can make a meaningful contribution by itself. (Smaller classes require more classrooms to insure a full school day, etc.)

Many teachers and supervisors will seek to be involved in this genuine educational experience. This is the essence of their professional commitment. The unity of purpose of the Council of Supervisory Associations and United Federation of Teachers working together with representatives of the Superintendent's staff to formulate such a program holds great promise for the future. It is our hope that this same spirit will be reflected in the democratic participation and active involvement of the members of the staff within each school.

No program can succeed without the genuine cooperation of parent and community agencies.

We know that the program will be expensive. It is the opinion of the committee that the cost of effective education must be paid if society is to fulfill its obligation to all the children. Nothing less will work. The time for innovation and bold planning is now.

A summary of the plan, as outlined by the committee in its report, is as follows:

Pupils and Curriculum

1. Integration will be a major factor in the choice of schools for the More Effective Schools Program.
2. The program will provide for education beginning at ages 3-4.
3. The school will be open from 8 a.m. - 6 p.m. with programs to meet the needs of the pupils.
4. Class size will vary from 15 in pre-kindergarten classes to a maximum of 22 in other grades.
5. Classes will include children with a wide range of abilities and personality traits, heterogeneously grouped. Individualized instruction in the 3 Rs will be provided for through flexible grouping.
6. Promising modern teaching methods will be implemented under optimum conditions. These will include team teaching, and non-graded blocs consisting of early childhood grades, grades 3-4 and 5-6.
7. Abundant supplies of modern teaching materials appropriate to urban communities will be necessary.
8. Provision will be made to meet the needs of children with physical, emotional, and social problems through a teacher, guidance and medical team.

9. Efforts will be made to overcome the effects of pupil and family mobility through closer cooperation with the Department of Housing, the Department of Welfare, and other social agencies. In addition, adjustments will be made in the present transfer regulations to encourage pupils to remain in their schools.
10. Close relations will be established with local colleges and universities for purposes of teacher training, curriculum development, research, and evaluation and project development.
11. Maximum use will be made of the newest techniques in audio-visual instruction, including closed circuit T.V.
12. Teacher specialists in art, music, and other curriculum areas will be used to enrich the instructional program.

Personnel

1. Efforts will be made to recruit a staff which is enthusiastic, able, and committed to the program. This will be achieved through the democratic involvement of teachers and supervisors.
2. Provision will be made for a continuous program of professional growth including payment by the Board of Education for one college course per semester.
3. In order to give teachers maximum time for concentration on instruction, teachers will receive a daily unassigned preparation period, and relief from all non-teaching duties.

School Plant and Organization

1. Maximum use of the school plant will be made for a full school day, weekends, and during the summer months.
2. Facilities will be sought for outside the regular school plant, in office buildings, settlement houses, etc.
3. Schools will be located so as to achieve maximum integration.

Community Relations

1. Each school will have a Community Relations Expert to promote good human relations among the children, the staff, and the community.
2. Wide and sustained community involvement will be encouraged through the parent associations, parent workshops, and community organizations.

More detailed information about the MES Program plan will be given in subsequent chapters of this report as implementation accomplishments to date are discussed.

Reference

Report of Joint Planning Committee for More Effective Schools to the Superintendent of Schools. New York City Public Schools, May 15, 1964.

CHAPTER 2

MAIN FINDINGS OF PREVIOUS EVALUATION STUDIES

Reports of earlier evaluation studies have been published by the Bureau of Educational Research of the New York City Board of Education, the Center for Urban Education, and the United Federation of Teachers. The principal findings of these studies are summarized in this chapter.

Bureau of Educational Research, 1966 (1). The first two years of operation of the MES Program, extending from the fall of 1964 to the spring of 1966, were evaluated by a research team of the Bureau of Educational Research. Questionnaires, inventories, standardized tests, and central office records were used as the principal means of appraising the implementation and accomplishments of the program. The main conclusions that were reported are as follows:

1. Objectives that had been fully implemented were those that were related to class size, heterogeneous grouping, teaching materials, cooperation with local colleges, audiovisual techniques, teacher specialists, staff recruitment, teacher preparation periods, and the use of community relations experts.
2. The other objectives had been implemented to various degrees. Many classes had been initiated for four-year olds, but few for three-year olds; all the schools used team teaching, but only one applied the non-graded bloc method; the pupil personnel team was qualified for dealing with emotional and social problems, but did not include sufficient medical personnel for physical problems; some courses were offered to teachers and some scholarships were available to them, but financing did not come from the Board of Education; teachers were allotted a daily preparation period, but were not completely freed of all non-teaching duties; the school plant was used fully during the school day and summer months, but not during weekends.
3. The ethnic composition of the pupil enrollment in the 21 participating schools had shown little

change during the two-year period. Ten of the schools were considered to have been integrated to a reasonable degree.

4. The instructional cost per pupil during the 1965-66 school year was $859 in the ten ME schools that had been established in 1964 and $930 in the eleven schools that had entered the program in 1965, as compared with $433 for other city elementary schools during the preceding year. The cost of instruction was considered to include both pedagogical and non-pedagogical salaries, as well as expenditures for school supplies and equipment.
5. Pupil mobility changes before and after the first year of the program were generally very small, but declines in the rates of mobility were registered in eight of the ten schools that were in their second year of the program.
6. The teacher mobility rate for the period of October, 1965 to June, 1966 was 6.2% for ME schools, as compared with 6.4% for the control schools. Although all teachers in the ME schools were given the option of transferring at the end of the school year, only 2.7% exercised this option to transfer to non-ME schools, and only 0.4% transferred to other ME schools.
7. The additional teaching positions assigned to the 21 ME schools brought the average class size and pupil-teacher ratio in both years of the program well below the average ratios for city elementary schools in general. The average class size for all 21 ME schools as of October, 1965 was 8.2 pupils fewer than the average for all other city elementary schools; the pupil-teacher ratio was 10.8 pupils smaller.
8. Pupil attendance rates in the 21 ME schools showed no evidence of change during the 1964-66 period.
9. Results of the Metropolitan Achievement Test showed that the pupils in the ten schools that had been in the MES program for two years had changed their median standing in relation to the national norms for their grades as follows: reading comprehension--gains of 2 or 3 months in grades 3, 5, and 6 as of May, 1966, but a loss of 2 months in grade 4; arithmetic problem solving and concepts--gains of 2 months in grade 4 and 4 months in grade 5, but no change in grade 6. This analysis was based on the scores of the pupils who took the tests in

both October, 1964 and May, 1966. Reading and arithmetic test results for a seven-month period during the 1965-66 school year, along with some comparative reading test data for control schools, were also reported. In general, these test results reflected the ME schools favorably.

10. Significant improvements in the oral communications abilities of the children in the ME schools were indicated by teachers' ratings of sizeable samples during the 1965-66 school year.
11. The questionnaire responses of district superintendents, principals, teachers, and parents in the spring of 1966 were decidedly favorable to the program. Strengths of the program cited by the district superintendents and principals included the instructional benefits made possible by the small class sizes, the pre-kindergarten classes, and the augmented supervisory staff. According to the district superintendents, the chief problem encountered was the resentment expressed by parents whose children attended schools that were not receiving the benefits of MES program participation. Of 835 MES parents who returned questionnaires, some 86% judged the program to be helpful to their children.

The report was concluded with the following statement:

> Analysis of costs has made it clear that the MES program requires considerable funding. On the basis of the evaluation as a whole, it would appear that the program needs to be kept essentially undiluted if it is to remain effective. If such elements as small class size are not retained, it is quite possible that the educational results will not be as favorable as this report has shown them to be.

Center for Urban Education, 1967 (2). The Center for Urban Education (CUE), a Regional Educational Laboratory of the U.S. Office of Education, evaluated the third year (1966-67) of the program's operation. Attention was focused mainly on the quality of classroom instruction, which was evaluated largely through observational ratings. In addition, the opinions of school administrators, teachers, and supplementary professional staff members were obtained from interviews and questionnaires. Inventories were administered to the children in the upper grades to tap their self-concepts and their attitudes toward their schools and classes. Reading and arithmetic achievement test results were also analyzed, and record data in areas such as attendance, class size, and costs were reviewed and discussed. The study covered 21 ME schools and 8 control schools.

Following is a summary of the principal conclusions that were reported:

1. A wide range of variation among the ME schools was evident on every criterion the evaluators considered, but the differences tended to be obscured in the composite evaluation of the program.
2. In the areas of school climate and staff attitudes, most of the ME schools were characterized by enthusiasm, interest, hope, and a belief by all levels of the staff that the MES setting was pedagogically favorable. Parents and community members also showed enthusiasm for their neighborhood ME schools. This was regarded as an important accomplishment in a school system that is accustomed to stress and school-community conflict.
3. The observers' classroom ratings and the results of standardized tests indicated that the children in the ME schools did not differ significantly from those in the control schools with respect to classroom performance or ability in reading and mathematics. The achievement test data also showed that the profiles of the ME schools had not changed during the course of the program. Furthermore, gains which had been noted in previous evaluations had not been maintained during 1966-67, with the result that retardation below the urban norms for reading was no better, and in some cases worse than before. The program was therefore construed to have had a brief positive effect on achievement, which was not maintained past the first year or two. The evaluators reported that they saw no reason to expect better achievement in reading or arithmetic or any significant alteration in the retardation pattern from the MES program as it was being conducted, despite the positive findings in the areas of morale and school climate.
4. Little progress was seen in the directions of innovation or restructurization in the basic teaching process. All levels of the staff reportedly attributed this weakness in the program to the lack of experience and special preparation of the teachers. The lack of academic progress of the children was attributed mainly to the teachers' failure to revise their techniques of instruction to obtain the presumed advantages of the small class sizes.

5. As an over-all conclusion, the evaluators noted that elaborate and expensive administrative restructuring of a school--including reduced class sizes and provision of specialized teaching, psychological, social, and health services--are likely to have a dramatic impact on adult observers or staff members, but will not necessarily result in improvement of children's functioning. The evaluators expressed the hope that comparable radical revision and restructurization of the curriculum and instructional process would produce such improvement.

Since the original proposal for MES had included recommendations for reshaping the curriculum, the invention and refinement of new practices, and teacher involvement in experimentation and exploration of new methodology, the evaluators concluded that the program had not been fully implemented by the end of 1967. The study was therefore considered to have been a limited evaluation of the MES concept as originally outlined and proposed.

Center for Urban Education, 1968 (3). The Center for Urban Education also evaluated the program for the 1967-68 school year. This study was concentrated on three criterion areas: implementation of the program's design, the quality of the instructional process, and the educational benefits gained by the children. Evaluative information was obtained through procedures that included interviews, classroom observations, questionnaire surveys, and standardized tests. The principal findings may be summed up as follows:

1. Procedures, staffing, and organization fulfilled all the original MES proposals, except that little education for three-year-olds had been provided, and no solution had been found for the problem of discontinuity when a child's family moved from the neighborhood.

2. So far as the educational process was concerned, the program was more thoroughly implemented than ever before. Small classes were being used in the ME schools with consistently good effects, specialists were used widely for instruction, and grouping was often used to provide special instruction to children according to their levels of development.

3. The achievement test results did not show any evidence of progress in the schools in the area of arithmetic. Some improvement was noted in the reading area, but this was not consistent for all grades. On the basis of that type of evidence, the evaluators concluded that the program

> as it has been implemented for the past several years "is not an immediate and consistent solution to the problems of retardation in the academic areas." This conclusion was modified by an observation that, since 1967-68 was the first full year of close approximation of the MES instructional model, "one may legitimately expect to see more consistent 'pay-off' in terms of improved pupil functioning in future evaluations."

After citing evidence that showed the ME schools seemed to excel in over-all school functioning, especially in the area of climate and attitude, the evaluators stated that the typical ME school in 1967-68 was characterized by good relations between the staff and children, attractiveness to parents and observers, and good teaching practices.

Bureau of Educational Research, 1968 (4). As part of a continuing series of longitudinal studies of the MES program, the Bureau of Educational Research analyzed the reading achievement progress of pupils who were in grades 2-5 in October, 1965, and who were retested in April, 1967. The results of the Metropolitan Reading Tests, administered in the city-wide testing program, were used as the data base. Alternate forms of the tests had been administered on the two occasions, separated by 1.6 school years. Various types of analyses of the data for the 21 ME schools and 9 control schools led to the following conclusions:

1. The pattern of reading improvement was consistently in favor of the ME schools, as compared with the control schools. The gains of the MES pupils, in terms of grade equivalent score averages, exceeded those of the controls by about one to three months at each of the grade levels, 3-6, in the spring of 1967.
2. The reduction in reading retardation was, in general, greater for the MES groups than for the control groups.

It was noted that these findings were at variance with those reported by the Center for Urban Education in 1967 (2). The rigorous longitudinal approach that was followed in this 1968 study of the Bureau of Educational Research, and the use of control groups for all comparisons that were made in this study, were cited as the reasons for the differences between its findings and those of the earlier CUE evaluation.

Bureau of Educational Research, 1968 (5). The effectiveness of MES pre-kindergarten training in developing basic reading skills was evaluated in a study reported by the Bureau of Educational Research in June, 1968. In this study, 117 children who were in the first grade in ME schools in 1966-67, and who had been in pre-kindergarten during the 1964-65 school year, were matched individually with schoolmates who had not had pre-kindergarten training. The children were matched on the basis of sex and scores on the New York State Reading Readiness Test given in September, 1966. Most of the children in both groups had attended kindergarten in the ME schools where they were enrolled as first graders. The two groups were compared with respect to their scores on the vocabulary part of the Gates-MacGinitie Primary Reading Test in February and June of 1967, and on the reading comprehension and word knowledge subtests of the Metropolitan Primary Reading Test in May, 1967.

The results showed that the first-grade children who had attended pre-kindergarten attained vocabulary and word knowledge average scores that were significantly higher than those of their schoolmates who had not been in pre-kindergarten. The average scores of the two groups on the reading comprehension part of the Metropolitan test did not differ significantly, however.

Bureau of Educational Research, 1969 (6). In a recent interim report of its continuing longitudinal studies, the Bureau of Educational Research analyzed reading achievement test data of four ME schools and their designated control schools. The MES pupil sample consisted of third-grade children who had been in the ME schools for at least 16 school months, and fourth and fifth-grade pupils who had been in those schools for a minimum of 26 school months. The sizes of the grade-group samples in the ME schools ranged from 263 to 395.

The Metropolitan Word Knowledge and Reading Comprehension Test score averages of the MES and control groups were compared. Progress in reading achievement was evaluated over the period of October, 1966 to April, 1968 for the third-grade group, and from October, 1965 to April, 1968 for the fourth and fifth-grade groups.

Following is a condensation of the conclusions that were reached:

1. The MES grade groups consistently surpassed the corresponding control groups in the pattern of reading growth.
2. The mean gains in reading comprehension for the MES groups exceeded those of the control groups by 2.5 to 4.5 school months over the periods studied. In word knowledge, the gains of the MES groups were 2.5 to 7.0 school months larger than those of the control groups.
3. The reduction in reading retardation was, in general, greater for the MES groups than for the control groups. In April, 1968, the MES groups were one to five school months below the national grade norms, while the control groups fell four to nine school months below the same grade norms.
4. The reduction in reading retardation of the MES groups, as compared to that of the control groups, was more pronounced at the third-grade level than at the fourth and fifth-grade levels.

United Federation of Teachers, 1969 (7). In the May 4, 1969 issue of The United Teacher newspaper, Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test score averages for an ME school in the East Harlem area were compared with averages for 15 non-ME schools in the same area. The data had been submitted by the principal of the ME school.

The reading comprehension grade equivalent averages of the ME school were shown to be 4 to 11 months higher than those of the group of 15 other schools for each grade in the 2-6 range. Also, the percentages of children at or above the national norm median at each of these three grade levels were larger for the ME school than for the other schools.

At four of the five grade levels studied, the percentages of children who were retarded to the extent of falling eight or more months below the national norm medians were smaller for the ME school than for the other schools.

The results of a follow-up study of the pupils in the same ME school were also reported. It was shown that the averages of the Metropolitan Reading Comprehension and Word Knowledge grade equivalent scores of the pupils who were in the second, third, and fourth grades in 1966 increased 19 to 28 months during the 17-18 school-months period between May or June of 1966 and March, 1968. These findings were regarded as "especially significant, since studies show that most children in Harlem generally fall further behind each year."

Summary of Previous Evaluation Findings

In 1966, the Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education evaluated the first two years of the MES program. According to the Bureau's report, the program had realized its objectives as to reduced class size, heterogeneous grouping, teaching materials, use of teacher specialists and community relations experts, and staff recruiting. The rate of pupil attendance had not changed, but in some grades improvement was noted in reading, arithmetic, and oral communications.

The next year, an evaluation by the Center for Urban Education indicated that enthusiasm, hope, and student attitudes had improved in the ME schools more than classroom achievement. The introduction of new teaching methods and special preparation of teachers had not been implemented, the report explained, and this failure was held to be a major factor in the children's lack of academic progress.

The 1968 evaluation, also by the Center for Urban Education, noted considerable improvement in the areas where shortcomings had been found in 1967. As a result, small classes were used to good effect, it was said, but gains in student achievement did not correspond. Slight improvement in reading in some grades was recorded, but more substantial progress was thought to need longer exposure of pupils to the MES techniques.

In the same year, a series of Bureau of Educational Research studies concluded that MES pupils' gains in terms of grade equivalent score averages were well above those of control groups. In 1968, the Bureau also evaluated the MES pre-kindergarten program. It found that first-grade pupils with pre-kindergarten experience had vocabulary and word-knowledge scores that were significantly higher than did classmates who had no such experience, but the two groups rated about equally in reading comprehension.

In 1969, a Bureau of Educational Research report on comparisons of third-grade students in four ME schools with their counterparts in four control schools showed that the former were several months ahead of the others in reading comprehension and word knowledge.

Another 1969 study comparing test score averages for one ME school in East Harlem with averages for 15 non-ME schools in the same area was published in The United Teacher for May 4. It showed the MES students ahead of the others in reading comprehension and percentage of children above the national norm median, and, in four of five grades, having a smaller percentage falling eight months or more below the national norm.

REFERENCES

1. Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program Summary Report. Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, September, 1966.
2. Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program. Center for Urban Education, September, 1967.
3. More Effective Schools. Center for Urban Education, December, 1968.
4. Measuring Pupil Growth in Reading in the More Effective Schools. Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, April, 1968.
5. Measuring the Effect of Pre-Kindergarten Experience on Reading Progress Among First Graders in More Effective Schools. Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, June, 1968.
6. Longitudinal Study of Reading Growth in Selected More Effective and Comparable Schools. Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, March, 1969.
7. "More Effective Schools in Danger Unless City Restores Full Funding," The United Teacher. The United Federation of Teachers, May 4, 1969.

CHAPTER 3

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, DESIGN, AND PROCEDURES

The Psychological Corporation's evaluation of the MES Program for the 1968-69 school year was focused on the following principal objectives:

1. Documentation and appraisal of the current extent of implementation of the plans and procedures that the Joint Planning Committee had established for the program in 1964.
2. Evaluation of the program's effects on the students, their parents, community and the school staff members.

Evaluation Design

All the 18 ME schools, as well as the 8 control schools that had been involved in previous evaluation studies, were subjected to intensive study through a research design that incorporated observations, questionnaire surveys, interviews, and record data analyses. The ME and control schools were compared in as many aspects as possible. A longitudinal study of progress in reading and arithmetic skills development, involving students who had been in the schools at least two years, was also included. In addition, a junior high school follow-up study dealing with the reading test scores of samples of students from two pairs of ME and control schools and one additional ME school was conducted.

The eight control schools had been selected by the Bureau of Educational Research several years ago. Seven of these schools had been matched with ME schools on a one-to-one basis, and the other served as a control for two ME schools. The basis for matching was similarity of the ethnic composition of the pupils and of the socio-economic levels of the neighborhoods. Changes in the school neighborhoods during the past few years probably have weakened the matchings, however, and this should be taken into consideration when the findings are interpreted. No controls were available for nine of the ME schools.

Evaluation Procedures

During the first stage of the study, senior members of the evaluation staff met with the Director of the Bureau of Educational Research and his associates to discuss the evaluation plans for the year. After the plans had been approved, the project director was consulted to obtain information about the program and to establish guidelines for implementing the procedures. Members of the evaluation team then made preliminary visits to several ME schools to gain a perspective for developing questionnaires and preparing structured guides for observations and interviews. The subsequent procedures were as follows:

1. Each of the ME and control schools was visited by members of the evaluation staff at least twice for interview and observational purposes. Samples of classes at all grade levels were observed, but the first, third, and fifth grades were given the most attention. Among the characteristics rated during the school and classroom observations were: teaching methods, facilities, use of instructional equipment and supplies, test administration and proctoring, in-service training of staff members and paraprofessionals, parent meetings, workshops, and administrative meetings.

   Interviews were conducted with the following personnel on a sampling basis: school principals, guidance counselors, teachers, social workers, family workers, family assistants, medical and psychological personnel, community coordinators, and parents.

2. Student questionnaires were developed and sent to all the ME and control schools for administration to all fifth-grade students. These questionnaires were designed to elicit information about the students' self-images, self-confidence, and their attitudes toward school, teachers, and schoolmates.

3. Specially constructed questionnaires were also used to survey the opinions and attitudes of teachers, specialists, paraprofessionals, and the parents of fifth-grade children in the ME and control schools. Information about the effectiveness of the program was requested from the school staff members in certain sections of their questionnaires.

4. The reading and arithmetic gains of the fifth-grade MES and control students over the two-year period, 1967-69, were compared. Metropolitan Achievement Test scores were used for this phase of the evaluation, which was limited to those students who had been in the schools at least two years and who had taken the tests in both 1967 and 1969.

5. In the junior high school follow-up study, seventh-grade Metropolitan reading test scores were compared with the 1967 fifth-grade scores of two years ago. The sample was drawn from two junior high schools that enroll students from paired ME and control schools. Some additional follow-up data of a similar type were provided by the assistant principal of an ME school that did not have a matching control school.

6. Near the end of the spring term, the project director and some of the district superintendents were interviewed to obtain their views of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, as well as the outlook for it.

7. With the cooperation of several bureaus of the Board of Education and the school principals, record data for the ME and control schools were collected. Among the areas covered were: student enrollment, average daily attendance, and attrition rates; expenditures for salaries, supplies, and equipment; and size and composition of the school staffs.

8. During the course of the year, representatives of the evaluation staff attended several special meetings and functions related to the program, such as a community block party conducted by one of the ME schools, the graduation ceremonies of another, and a UFT-sponsored Saturday workshop for parents and teachers of all the ME schools in the city.

A detailed account of the evaluation findings is given in the following chapters of this report.

SECTION II

INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION FINDINGS IN THE ME SCHOOLS

20/21

CHAPTER 4

INTERVIEW FINDINGS

To appraise the progress of the MES program in accomplishing its general objectives, and also to make a survey of opinions and attitudes, each ME school and each control school was visited at least twice. During each visit, two to six full lessons were observed. Members of the evaluation team also visited several classrooms at each grade level for detailed observations. In all, more than 130 full lessons were observed, and more than 300 classrooms were visited. Although a formal checklist was used to record information bearing on the effectiveness of instruction, every effort was made to preserve informality and to avoid interrupting the normal instructional procedures.

During the course of the visits, the evaluators interviewed administrators, specialists, teachers, non-professionals, parents, and pupils. The principal of each school was interviewed at least once. In a majority of the schools, the assistant principals were also interviewed.

The evaluators talked with at least one guidance counselor and two other members of the guidance team in each school. Because of the program's thrust toward developing desirable relationships between the schools and their communities, particular attention was given to the roles of the community coordinators, social workers, family workers, and parents in preparing and executing school and community programs. Almost without exception, the community coordinator was interviewed, or at least one other member of the school staff who was immediately concerned with community relations. The evaluators talked to more than 300 parents to learn about their attitudes toward the MES program.

Teachers in each of the schools--usually at least ten--were also interviewed to determine how they felt about various aspects of the MES program. The total number of teachers interviewed exceeded 400. In some schools, the observers joined teachers during both informal and formal faculty meetings. The observers also attended school and community functions during out-of-school hours, and conversed with teachers and parents on those occasions.

The interview findings will be introduced in this chapter, and then will be discussed further in connection with the observational findings in the subsequent chapters of this section of the report.

Interviews With Principals

The majority of principals who were interviewed were enthusiastic in their endorsements of the MES program. One principal seemed to express the consensus when he said that the program has great merit and is the best possible existing solution to the present dilemma of the urban elementary school. Another stated that he had been familiar with the program before he took his present assignment, which he had accepted only because he was confident that MES was a possible method of overcoming the difficulties of disadvantaged students.

Another principal said that the program provides the most effective approach to "reaching" disadvantaged children and to increasing the possibility that some slow learners could progress toward substantial academic achievement. Principals who had been in More Effective Schools for several years and could compare the program with that in other schools, as well as more recently appointed principals, seemed to share this point of view.

Several said that they would not want to be assigned to their schools if these schools were to be eliminated from the program. Principals and their staffs, in general, expressed the hope that the program will not only continue, but will be strengthened and extended to all schools in the city.

Teachers' interest in the program, according to many principals, was evidenced by their enthusiasm. Almost without exception, principals claimed that their teachers and other staff members were united and most cooperative in their efforts to do the best possible job.

When asked to specify the aspects of the program they thought to be most beneficial, principals almost invariably said that the larger staff enabled the school to individualize instruction, guidance, and health service. The decrease in class size and the increase in services were reported to have helped teachers to give pupils more special attention. This, in turn, most principals reported, changed the nature of discipline problems--fewer crisis cases arose, and pupil behavior improved.

Principals credited the increase of professional staff and additional service personnel with substantially reducing the non-teaching duties of classroom teachers in the More Effective Schools in recent years. Only two principals indicated little evidence of change in this area of teachers' assignments, while six principals reported almost complete elimination of the non-instructional duties of their teachers.

According to the principals, the smaller class registers and the substantial increase in the number of classroom teachers resulted in the improvement of the overall classroom program and increased ability of the schools to handle educational problems in urban areas.

The staffs of the More Effective Schools have been augmented in many ways, the principals reported. All said they had three or more assistant principals. All had an administrative assistant. The ratio of secretarial assignments to school staff, according to a majority of the principals, exceeded that of other schools.

Although many more teacher specialists were assigned to ME schools than to other schools, the subject areas of their specialties did not seem to be uniform in most schools, according to the information given by the principals.

Clinical guidance services in these schools, however limited, were reported to far outweigh those of other schools.

According to the principals, no additional paraprofessional positions were allotted to ME schools.

The contribution of cluster teachers to the individualization of instruction was praised. Several principals said they had assigned the more experienced and strongest teachers to this position for the purpose of training other members of the teaching team and coordinating their efforts.

Because of the special features of the program, the diversity of staff, and, in most cases, the youth and inexperience of staff, several principals expressed a need for the services of a teacher-trainer. This, they said, would facilitate the effective development, introduction, and implementation of new instructional programs. Some principals expressed the opinion that the program was good, but its effectiveness has been limited because many of the teachers have had insufficient experience.

All the principals indicated that steps had been taken, or had been planned, to reduce pupil mobility (enrollment turnover). Relatively little progress had been made in this direction, however.

Bussing of pupils, according to principals, is not a problem of these schools. Only one principal reported that a sizeable number of pupils were bussed for "open enrollment." Several principals said that their schools provided transportation for the mentally and physically handicapped.

Although these schools were organized on a heterogeneous basis, all but one principal stated that special grouping arrangements were made for instruction in reading and in mathematics. Most of the principals reported that some special grouping was done for language instruction. All of the principals indicated that ethnic background and social development had not been a consideration in grouping for language instruction. Special classes had been formed for atypical children in a majority of schools.

Principals reported that curriculum area specialists had had a substantial impact on the pupils in most instances. Some individual specialists, however, were regarded as ineffectual in the performance of their duties. Several principals suggested the need for better selection of such personnel with respect to interest, training, and experience.

A question asked of all the principals in regard to the degree of teacher mobility during the school year, revealed that 116 of a total of 1,422 teachers had changed their assignments. This constituted 8.2% of the total. All but about 10% of these had been replaced by new teachers. Considering the number of transfers and leaves associated with moving out of town, marriages, and maternity, this rate is probably in line with that of other schools in the city.

Several principals said that they and their staff members assisted local colleges in training student teachers by providing classroom experience. A very limited number of principals reported relationships with colleges in curriculum development, research, evaluation, or program development. Many of the principals expressed recognition of the need for encouraging colleges to develop closer relationships with the school system, especially through programs such as MES.

Each of the principals reported having an orientation program for teachers newly assigned to the school. More than half of the schools, according to the principals' statements, had a teacher-trainer on their staffs. Assistant principals and experienced teachers contributed to the in-service training program by giving demonstration lessons, and district supervisors conducted in-service courses as needed. Additionally, local colleges offered tuition-free courses to the school faculty members who worked with student teachers. Evidently these provisions for in-service training did not go far enough, however, since many principals said that a special in-service training program should be planned and developed for the teachers in the More Effective Schools.

Among the problems mentioned by the principals, that of space ranked high. Five principals reported that they needed space in the neighborhood for classrooms, while the same number wanted it for other purposes.

All of the principals reported that they had one or more funded programs in operation in addition to that of the More Effective Schools. The sources of funds were varied. No marked correlation of purpose or structure among these programs was indicated, with the exception of the after-school program, Head Start, the summer elementary school, and the vacation day camp. The More Effective Schools did not seem to be favored over other schools in being selected to participate in these special programs.

Some type of out-of-school program was conducted in all of the school plants involved, according to the principals. Only one of the schools, however, was used for a total program seven days weekly during the regular school year and in the summer. With two exceptions, the schools had one or more programs during the summer.

Student Achievement

Although the students' academic growth admittedly has been relatively slow, and only limited gains have been made in reading and mathematics, the principals in general reported that great improvements have been made in attitudes, general courtesy, social behavior, and pupil attendance. This view was also held by a majority of the assistant principals and other members of teaching and administrative staffs interviewed. A few principals, however, reported that although pupils reacted favorably to the program, their attitudes and behavior have not improved very substantially.

In several schools, charts depicting reading test scores showed steady improvement over a period of four or five years. Principals generally agreed, however, that because of the high pupil mobility rate in most More Effective Schools, charting of reading growth on a school-wide basis was difficult, and, in some cases, unwise.

Staffing

Alert and enthusiastic assistant principals are necessary for the smooth running of the program, most principals suggested. The value of an administrative assistant to the general administration of each of the More Effective Schools was also pointed out by a majority of principals. Some were emphatic about the need for this position.

Most of the principals expressed the opinion that the MES program should be centrally directed, and that it should continue without major changes. Some expressed an interest in converting the program into an autonomous city-wide district.

A fear about the possible effects of decentralization on the program was indicated by the principals. Some said that local control of funds would lead to serious questioning of the defensibility of spending so much for More Effective Schools when other schools seemed to be deprived of necessary services. Rather than risk weakening the program through decentralization, the principals preferred extending it to a larger number of schools.

A major concern expressed by a majority of the principals was that parents and community members were not yet sufficiently involved in the school program. More progress in this area was regarded as necessary.

In general, the principals concurred in the opinion that the wide variety of extra services, the substantial assistance provided for the teaching and administrative staff, and the success achieved in giving children special attention in small classes would not have been possible without the MES program. The principals seemed to be like-minded in regarding these aspects of the program as most beneficial for the schools and their communities.

It was the consensus of the principals that the MES program has taken major strides toward solving the problems of disadvantaged children. The key to the success of the program, according to the principals, was not only the expanded budget and the increases in the staff and services, but also, and equally as important, the teachers' dedication to high standards of education.

Many principals stated that their staffs had effectively used community resources in developing curriculum materials and teaching approaches that encouraged students to take pride in their Afro-American, Puerto Rican or West Indian backgrounds. Further emphasis was being placed on this aspect of the school programs by having the children study the characteristics of their communities. This approach helped to improve the students' understanding of their immediate environment, and it also led to increased community understanding of the schools and their objectives.

The principals described various techniques that are being used to motivate students to take part in school activities. For example, one school is developing a program of intramural competition in basketball, touch football, and track. In this school, and in others also, shirts stenciled with the name or number of the school have been provided for the students to help develop pride in school membership.

To induce parents to become more active in school affairs, some principals had instituted procedures such as sending letters to the parents regularly to tell them about their children's progress, or giving notifications of honor-roll listings. Other principals told of their schools' expanded programs of school-community activities, which included cooperative field-days, parades, and block parties.

Most of the principals expressed enthusiasm about the work they were accomplishing under the MES guidelines. The principal's feeling was usually reflected in the atmosphere of the school. Where the principals did not seem to be enthusiastic, the program appeared to lack the vitality it showed in other schools.

Interviews With Assistant Principals

Assistant principals who were responsible for the basic supervision of the program in each of the schools were, on the whole, enthusiastic. Although they were usually assigned to supervise certain grade levels, several served as teacher-trainers either on a full-time or part-time basis, and some were helping to develop special aspects of the More

Effective Schools program in their schools. The assistant principals seemed to be serving with outstanding effectiveness in training of teachers and staff members. They also seemed to be invaluable as resource personnel in various subject areas and for specific grade levels.

The assistant principals explained that the relatively light duty load in MES permitted them not only to work closely with teachers and other staff members in developing understanding necessary to the success of the program, but also allowed them to devote a substantial amount of time to supervising classroom instruction.

A majority of the assistant principals evidently had demonstrated professional interest and leadership in improving instructional programs for various grade levels and in organizing orientation programs for teachers. Many described accomplishments in helping to develop parental interest in activities and special features of the schools. All of these roles were evidenced during observations in the schools. The evaluators found that the assistant principals in most of the ME schools were intensely involved in the activities of pupils, teachers, parents and community. Evidence of resourcefulness in the use of teaching materials and techniques was seen in most of the MES classrooms that were visited.

The general opinion of the assistant principals interviewed was that the morale of the school community had improved steadily under the beneficial influence of the MES program. Almost without exception, the assistant principals said that they believed the program should be continued, and possibly expanded.

Pride in the program and its effectiveness was indicated in the majority of the interviews. Practically all the assistant principals seemed to be fully aware of the main MES objectives. All of the assistants interviewed gave evidence in some way that they had adopted or developed departmental aims for the grade level they supervised to fit into the overall school program and meet the needs of that particular level. One assistant principal said that the most important noticeable gains resulting from the MES program were the staff members' increased involvement in school affairs and their development through experiences in working as a team. In his opinion, this increased involvement was the strongest possible "built-in" training program that a school could have. Another assistant principal reported that he had been assigned as a full-time teacher-trainer because inexperienced teachers in the school needed continuous training and guidance.

Several assistant principals voiced the opinion that veteran teachers with other than More Effective School experience were more appreciative of the program's values than were some of the younger teachers who had had no previous teaching experience. Some said that many younger teachers did not seem to understand the reason for limited class size, and therefore did not capitalize on the opportunities provided.

Several of those interviewed expressed the thought that the greatest change in teaching methods has resulted from planning of teaching procedures through "team" discussions. The consensus seemed to be that these discussions lead to improved understanding and articulation among the various curriculum areas.

In some schools, the assistants reported that they often had disciplinary and control responsibilities for corridors and cafeterias. Where this was the case, the services of the assistant principal as a resource person and as a professional educator helping to train teachers and develop curriculum materials seemed to be seriously impaired. In some instances other routine duties that might have been performed by paraprofessionals were being done by assistants. This, too, seemed to detract from the contributions that might have been made by the assistant principals.

Interviews With Teachers

The attitudes and opinions of most of the MES teachers who were interviewed reflected enthusiasm for the program. However, many of those interviewed, while in favor of the program, expressed individual viewpoints rather than generalized approval. Several were constructively critical.

Most of the teachers attested to the advantages of small classes, such as the opportunities afforded for getting to know pupils personally and teaching them individually. The teachers also praised the values of the services offered by the variety of specialists and others on the augmented staff, the abundance of materials, and the wealth of instructional aids.

Most of the younger teachers who were interviewed did not know enough about other types of school programs to make comparisons. Teachers who had come from other schools, however, were nearly unanimous in the opinion that the MES program surpassed others in developing desirable pupil attitudes and in tailoring instruction to individuals' needs. Many teachers indicated that the program's emphasis on individualization of instruction and services had successfully directed attention toward preventing, rather than correcting, student problems. During the course of their observations, the evaluators noted that the ME schools afforded pupils ample opportunities for using their time productively, and thereby forestalled the occurrence or development of undesirable behavior patterns.

Some teachers criticized the program because the instructional methods had not been fully adapted to the characteristics of inner-city children. Others said they saw a need for more widespread use of teaching techniques that are especially effective for heterogeneous or ungraded classes. For these and other reasons, many teachers advocated the development of a special training program for the MES instructional staff.

Several teachers said that the personality and philosophy of principals and other administrators were important to the success of the MES program. According to these teachers, an administrator who inspired their confidence was one who was receptive to new ideas and suggestions, served them as a resource person, and was constantly aware of the problems and needs of the pupils. The policy of most principals of ME schools in keeping their office doors open to everyone was endorsed.

Keen interest in helping children to learn was displayed by all the teachers interviewed. It was coupled with a willingness to improve teaching skills. Almost without exception, teachers of limited experience expressed a desire for a more comprehensive in-service training program, although they were at the same time appreciative of the help given them by assistant principals and other teachers. These teachers mentioned that they had difficulty in providing opportunities for creative pupil activity on an individual basis and in assigning worthwhile work to the bulk of the class while giving individual or small-group instruction to others. Several teachers expressed the opinion that the nature of the program called for specific training in MES philosophy and methods; others said that a larger number of experienced teachers with maturity and insight should have been assigned to MES.

Several of those interviewed would have preferred to work alone with a single class rather than as a member of a teaching team. Most of these teachers explained that the single-teacher approach permitted greater concentration on subject matter and enabled the students to adjust more easily, since they would be dealing with only one person instead of several. This last point, they suggested, was especially helpful for the already insecure child who has difficulty adjusting to a constantly changing classroom situation.

Generally, the teachers appreciated the heterogeneous grouping of MES classes, but many in the higher grades said they preferred homogeneous grouping because it saved time for teachers and pupils.

A majority of the teachers were favorably impressed with the MES program. They agreed that it brought about many desirable changes. They mentioned especially small class size, assignment of cluster teachers, flexibility of program and staff, and the in-service training program. Many attributed their high morale to the excellent teaching conditions and the multiplicity of assistance available. Some reported that teaching frustrations diminished when pupil progress became evident.

The teachers generally were enthusiastic about MES--the younger ones even more than the more experienced ones--although the latter showed a greater appreciation of the changes that the program was attempting to make. Many of the younger teachers did not know that MES was different from other programs in class size, number of personnel, supplies, and equipment. Younger teachers who had done their student teaching in ME schools did, however, seem to have a better understanding of the project as spelled out in the guidelines.

Interviews revealed a high degree of professionalism on the part of the teachers. This was evident in the concentrated efforts of teachers to improve their instructional methods and techniques, their cooperation with each other and other staff members, and their services to parents and pupils beyond formal requirements. In general, these teachers agreed that the teacher alone cannot do the job of educating inner-city children, but that the schools must make full use of the entire professional staff made available through the program.

Interviews With Staff Specialists

According to the information that specialists gave the evaluators during interviews, these staff members were implementing the program in accordance with the guidelines. In addition to the services they provided in the areas of enrichment, teacher-training, and individual instruction, they cooperated with teachers and other staff members in dealing with the problems of individual pupils and their families.

In some instances, the specific services rendered by the specialists could not be clearly delineated because their functions had been so thoroughly enmeshed in the school's program as a whole. On the other hand, some specialists indicated that they had experienced difficulties in fulfilling their roles because their responsibilities had not been clearly defined, or because they found themselves in cross-currents of administrative authority.

Some of the specialists said that staff activities in their schools had been coordinated successfully after the principals had established communication channels for assistant principals, guidance counselors, psychologists, social workers, and teachers. Several specialists expressed the opinion that well-trained staff members, working together, could diminish pupils' needs for remedial assistance.

Adequate office space was mentioned as one of the prime prerequisites for enabling the specialists to work efficiently and effectively. In several schools, rooms were reported to be needed for small-group instruction, clinical conferences, and meetings.

Interviews With Guidance Counselors

Interviews with guidance counselors, supported by observations, convinced the evaluators that a sufficient number of counselors had been assigned to the More Effective Schools, in the majority of instances. The guidance-team organization and reduction of pupil caseload permitted guidance to be developmental and preventive, leading to early discovery rather than routine and crisis counseling. In some schools, where a counselor's caseload was more than 350, the burden seemed to be too heavy for the nature of the population being served.

Counselors generally expressed the opinion that MES's clinical-team organization had been helpful, and had broadened the role of guidance, particularly in the primary grades. It was the consensus of those interviewed that increased attention to individual pupils had helped these students to develop a feeling of personal worth, and had led to an improvement in attitudes, appearance, and morale. Several counselors said that the individualization of guidance procedures stimulated the development of leadership abilities in some students. A positive effect attributed to the more intensive counseling was the small number of pupil suspensions in these schools.

Several counselors indicated that the adequacy of counseling cannot be determined by the mere number of counselors, because in some school communities counselors had to spend too much time serving as parent surrogates. Where parents placed the entire burden of teaching and being responsible for the child on the school, counselors made many parental, home, and agency contacts that interfered with their other guidance services. Counselors said that such home visits as the school program and pupil caseload permitted helped to develop community understanding and cooperation, and also stimulated a cooperative attitude on the part of parents.

Conferences involving a teacher, parent, and counselor were said to promote better understanding of pupil problems by teachers, as well as by parents. These meetings also seemed to stimulate parental interest in school affairs and contributed to parents' understanding of the program and the school's objectives. Counselors in several schools said that they conducted or participated in teacher or parent workshops. The effects of counselor activity in workshops and in-service training programs was apparent in the attitudes of teachers who were interviewed.

The close relationship between the guidance team and teachers in helping individual pupils gave the teachers greater insight into the reasons for student behavior, according to several counselors. This relationship also fostered development of pupils' personal and social growth, and contributed to broader teacher understanding of the children. In a majority of the ME schools, counselors reported that the guidance team approach and the assignment of community coordinators and family workers to help bridge the gap between school and community had increased parental involvement in the overall guidance program. Counselors in several schools said that neighborhood and agency relationships, made possible through the guidance team's additional personnel, enabled members of the team to obtain immediate medical and social services for pupils.

Counselors agreed that a school psychologist assigned on a full-time basis had a better opportunity to observe children in the total school setting. Part-time psychologists had to rely on interviews to obtain background information about those who were referred by teachers and supervisors. The broader observation permitted by MES was said to reveal pupil characteristics that enabled teachers to understand individual pupil behavior. The teacher-counselor conferences and direct services rendered to teachers by the guidance team was credited with stimulating a cooperative effort that did not seem to be prevalent in other schools.

Some ME schools, however, appeared to have difficulty in dividing responsibilities among members of the guidance team. In these schools, the team's work was obviously impeded, and morale suffered. In some instances assignments were not clear, or were made by staff members who, in the counselors' opinion, were uninformed about the contribution the guidance team could make. Specialists in these situations seemed to take little initiative.

Interviews With Paraprofessionals

Although several schools found the services of paraprofessionals to be helpful and to contribute to the overall program, many of these staff members, when interviewed, did not seem to know what their function was. In classrooms where they were present during the evaluators' observations and visits, their work consisted of simple tasks such as escorting children from place to place, helping children with clothing, and handing out paper for use in individual and small-group instruction. In this, they appeared to be very helpful and to free the teachers for instructional duties. (In some schools there seemed to be little difference between the assignment of duties to trained paraprofessionals and to other school aides.) In a few of the schools, little paraprofessional service was evident. Paraprofessionals in schools in Puerto Rican neighborhoods seemed to be among those most interested and well informed.

CHAPTER 5

THE SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNITY

Community involvement in the ME schools was observed to include parent participation in classroom learning situations and school services, the cooperation of community members and agencies in providing facilities and services, and the usual types of school-community relationships.

One of the aspects of the More Effective Schools program which became more apparent as this evaluation continued was the fact that the school was not to be considered as an entity in itself, but rather as an integral part of the community. No part of the school program seemed to be unaffected by the community, and no community being served by a More Effective School seemed to be unaffected by it.

The teachers' strike apparently had negatively affected relationships with the parents and community in many of the ME schools. Activities in progress, however, seemed to indicate that positive and constructive attitudes on the part of the parents and communities toward these schools were being restored.

Parents' Attitudes and Activities

When the parents in each of the More Effective Schools were interviewed, they were asked to give their views and opinions about the management of the school, the instructional program, and the supplementary services provided for the children. In almost all cases, parents were positive in their support of the MES program. Many letters on file from parents to local school administrators and staff members substantiated the information gained through interviews. Further evidence of parental endorsement of the program was provided by the fact that pupil mobility had decreased in several schools since the beginning of the program. The evaluators were informed that parents often falsify addresses in order to keep their children in a More Effective School. Parents in MES schools throughout the city generally expressed the opinion that the best evidence of the program's effectiveness is to be found in changes of attitude of the children and community members.

Practically all ME schools conduct special meetings, workshops, and other programs for parents. In some schools, a parent-teacher council has been organized to provide a forum for discussing school problems. In these schools, parents take an active part in discussing and trying to solve problems related to the administrative and educational program of the school. In one of the schools, an all-day meeting in the form of a luncheon workshop was conducted. This was attended by over 400 parents and teachers, with the latter participating on their own time. School breakfasts, theatre parties, and bus trips added to the development of parental interest in some of the schools.

In the majority of schools, the parents, with the cooperation of teachers and staff members, prepared mimeographed newsletters regularly to inform parents of school happenings. Several classroom teachers prepared their own newsletters to keep parents informed.

In schools that had been established before the More Effective Schools Program began, parent contacts had evidently increased greatly after the installation of the program. In most cases, these contacts had been encouraged and developed by community coordinators and guidance personnel in the school.

Almost without exception, the use of the Parents' Room in More Effective Schools appeared to be conducive to developing parental interest and pride in these schools and to initiating programs that tend to solidify the relationship of the schools with the community. In several schools, parents visited the room regularly for discussion periods and workshops, or to receive instruction in reading, child care, or sewing and other types of needlework. Instruction was provided on the basis of need and demand. Parents seemed willing to assist when they were capable of doing so. Community coordinators and family workers actively encouraged parents to use these rooms.

In many of the schools, the provision of workshop programs for parents had led parents to participate in school activities and to become acquainted with the objectives and methods of the school. Parent workshops, although conducted by the professional staff, were reported to be more effective when planned and promoted with the enlisted assistance of parents and community workers. Workshops were conducted in some of the schools three to five times a year, and were usually attended by 10 to 50 parents. Although these workshops were generally attended by very much the same group of parents each time they were given, some newcomers appeared on each occasion, having been attracted by the subject of the particular session.

In some of the schools, the assistant principals conducted periodic workshops for parents on a grade basis. Specialists in many schools also gave courses in the areas of their specialty. The evaluators observed some of these workshops, which appeared to be especially effective in developing better understanding between the home and the school.

The topics discussed in the parent workshops included guidance procedures, curriculum content, remedial reading, school control, neighborhood problems, and economical shopping. Going beyond demonstration lessons and talks, many of the teachers and administrators who conducted the workshops succeeded in getting the parents involved in discussions, decision-making, or active learning experiences.

In several of the schools with predominantly Negro populations, attendance at Parent Association meetings was stimulated by Afro-American cultural programs and curriculum-adjustment workshops. Special speakers and resource personnel from local agencies and clinics assisted in these school-community workshops at some of the schools. Several workshop programs were supplemented by trips to clinics and other agencies where assistance to parents and to other community members was available.

In one workshop observed in session, parents were attending a kindergarten class where concepts of shapes of mathematical figures were being developed. The parents participated in small groups as learners. In several instances, they asked the teacher to explain certain points. The procedures observed were generally effective, and they involved the parents as individuals rather than as members of a large, impersonal audience. In another school, parents who had volunteered to help poor achievers with reading and arithmetic were being coached in procedures to be used. A similar approach was used in a third school, where parents were invited to visit classrooms to observe their children working in small groups with their teachers, and also to participate in the lessons if they desired. After the visits, parents attended follow-up discussion meetings conducted by the teachers and the supervisors of the grade level observed.

In instances where a school or community event was centered in the school, the activities of parents in preparing for the event were channeled in directions which served to acquaint them with various aspects of the school program and to encourage them to become involved in decisions regarding these aspects. The workshop approach was used in several of these instances. In one school, the parents' interest and pride in the school and its affairs resulted in their request that a school uniform, with the school insignia and name attached, be supplied for each pupil. The polling of parents in this matter resulted in a positive vote from 97% of the parents. Although the school population was predominantly of Puerto Rican background, Negro parents were as strong as the majority in their request for the school uniform.

Bi-weekly sessions for parents of children in CRMD* classes were being held in one school to acquaint parents with the CRMD program, its teaching methods, and the assistance and opportunities available to the children.

Through State Urban Aid grants, some schools have been able to conduct weekly evening workshops on a variety of school-related topics.

Parents in several schools assisted teachers and paraprofessionals with the mechanics of school control and classroom procedures. Community coordinators and administrators in several schools were making strong efforts to enlist greater parental involvement. Getting parents of upper-grade pupils to become interested in school affairs seemed to be particularly difficult, however. Several schools that had previously suffered from parental or community criticism appeared to be successful in turning the tide of opinion in their favor.

---

* Children with Retarded Mental Development

Parent Association Activities

The average attendance at meetings of the Parents' Associations in More Effective Schools ranged from 15 to 50, according to reports and observations. Although individual parents, in the majority of cases, responded positively to questions regarding the nature of help and instruction provided for their children, and expressed keen interest, there seemed to be little evidence of extensive activity or membership in Parents' Associations. In the majority of More Effective Schools, small groups of parents seemed to carry the burden of running the Association. Almost without exception, officers and other members of Parents' Associations were present and active in the schools at the time visits were made.

The fact that many parents did not attend the meetings regularly may not have been a sign of disinterest, but rather an indication of their confidence in the efforts of the school to do something beyond what may be expected for their children. Insecurity on the part of some parents and the high degree of mobility in the community both seem to contribute to limited attendance, however. Another possible reason for small attendance was pointed out by some principals who said that many parents had a general fear of traveling in the neighborhood or leaving their homes at night.

The number of interested parents who visited the schools during the day was extremely large in comparison with the small attendance at parents' evening meetings. Attendance of parents at schools during the day may be attributed to both their interest in the program of the school and their fear for their children's safety. Parents often brought their children to school, regardless of age, stayed with them during the lunch period, and waited until school was dismissed to escort them home.

As an illustration of interest in the program, however, some parents reported that others who had moved out of More Effective School neighborhoods wanted their children to remain at the neighborhood MES because "much more is going on at this school" than in other schools they had known. It seems obvious that parental group feeling and support can not be appraised solely in terms of attendance at formal meetings of Parents' Associations.

Several local Parents' Associations had engaged in raising funds to pay for enriching activities outside of the regular school program during afternoons and weekends. Money was obtained from neighborhood agencies to pay for bus trips and for other learning experiences for pupils and for parents. In one school, parents sponsored a trip to Philadelphia for a large group of fifth-grade pupils. Through the assistance of parents, fifth-grade pupils in another school had acted as hosts to children who came from an ME school in Detroit to visit New York. In some schools of predominantly Puerto Rican populations, day-long programs were devoted to developing interest in Spanish cultures and international affairs.

One school sponsored a block party for the pupils, faculty, staff, and community. Preparations became a motivating force for each of these groups during a period of several months before the party. Spanish food, music, dancing, and the crowning of a king and queen were cultural highlights of this event. Not only did the school and the parents seem to become more closely united because of this festive occasion, but merchants and other community members contributed gifts and prizes to support the undertaking. Preparation for this event and the party itself were observed. Several interviews were held with parents, teachers, and members of the community who attended this party.

In another community, the school and community jointly plan and conduct an annual block party and parade, which take place on the school grounds on a Sunday in May. The principal and parents explained that the purpose of the event is to provide an opportunity for the school to work with the community and to strengthen support for the school's programs. In still another community, teachers, parents, and the community members were cooperating in clearing a nearby grass plot to gain much-needed outdoor play space for pre-kindergarten and kindergarten children. This work was being done on a voluntary basis on Saturdays.

Teachers and supervisors apparently had been actively engaged in stimulating parents' interest and involvement through various special activities in the schools. A breakfast program had been proposed in one school to insure adequate breakfasts for all children. In another instance, a program to provide each child with at least one paperback book of his own was underway. An outdoor art show had been sponsored each year by one of the other schools to motivate children in this curriculum area, and also to bring about better parental and community understanding of the work of the school. In many of the schools visited, pupil work in choral, vocal, and instrumental music was observed to be effective in developing parental interest.

During visits to several schools, exhibits and fairs were observed while they were in progress. An exhibit of pupil science activities, as well as projects representing work in all phases of the curriculum, was seen at the science fair of one of the schools. Parental and community participation were apparent in a majority of these events. In a number of schools, weekend family bus trips to zoos and to other points of interest had become a part of the regular school program.

On the whole, parental interest and participation seemed to be more representative of middle class families than of those in the lower-income bracket. The consensus of the principals, teachers, and parents interviewed, however, seemed to be that the Parent Associations in the More Effective Schools have been expanding their activities and have been stimulating the interest of parents of all income levels.

Community Relationships

The relationships of the majority of More Effective Schools with community agencies seemed to be very favorable. Most of the schools had established and maintained contacts with welfare agencies, housing authorities, police precinct councils, clinics, and neighborhood organizations. Relationships had also been established, in most cases, with such organizations as the NAACP and CORE, community progress centers, Catholic and Protestant councils, hospitals and health clinics, and social agencies in the community.

The reliance of the community on the school as a center was evidenced in one case by a group of neighborhood representatives who sought the principal's help in arranging for protection of the neighborhood against a wave of daylight purse-snatching. In another instance, the Housing Authority was assisted by a school that provided space to display a model of a new housing development that was to be built in the community. In all communities, regular police-precinct council meetings were attended by representatives of the school staff. Several More Effective Schools worked with local churches and other agencies to develop and evaluate Head Start programs.

Plans were under way at several schools for studying various community services to bring about better pupil and parent understanding of the educational program and the services that the school offered to the community. Representatives of various agencies had been asked to visit these schools to assist in this effort. Where feasible, pupils in these schools were taken to visit agencies in the community to give them first-hand experiences. In several schools, programs dealing with Afro-American culture, involving special guests and artists, were arranged with community assistance.

These, as well as other programs designed to enrich the regular school program, were backed in many cases by community agencies. In one school visited, an unscheduled program was being presented by a local Negro leader who was dressed in African attire. The leader explained the value of personal responsibility, education, and communication, and the evils of violence, chaos, and confusion. The message was delivered in the language of the area. The pupils seemed to respond enthusiastically.

Work with community agencies in other areas was typified by the cooperation of an Urban Aid Program which provided 10 pianos and a piano teacher for the pupils of one school. As a result of good community-school relationships, many pupils in this school became interested in music and are now learning to play the piano.

The general attitude toward the ME schools of communities having specific racial tension problems seemed to be favorable. Parents of children in several schools were opposed to the teacher work-stoppage that occurred during the early part of the school year and asked that the schools be kept open. In some schools, approximately 25% of the staff reported for work regularly. Most of these schools were kept open during afternoons and evenings for community programs.

In some instances, parents and community groups seemed to be extremely effective in controlling the nature of the school program, and appeared to be instrumental in determining the content of instruction. Some strain because of racial tension was evident even though these schools are run smoothly and efficiently. The presence of an office of a militant group in the immediate vicinity of one school seemed to contribute to the unrest in this school.

The Community Coordinators

In the majority of schools, the community coordinator, who worked as a member of a cooperative team, contributed immeasurably to the interaction of the schools and the community. The consensus of the principals was that having a member of the staff function as a coordinator of school and community activities was one of the most valuable contributions of the More Effective Schools program. Most of the principals and teachers said that the coordinators were capable and highly competent. The coordinators were described as being particularly effective in establishing and maintaining desirable school-home and school-community relationships, in assisting the guidance and health personnel in making parental contacts or clinical appointments, and in interpreting educational concepts and language for parents. The work of the coordinator seemed to be particularly effective in developing parental understanding of pupil and family needs in the health area. Previous experience as a teacher or in health or social services seemed to be especially valuable in the coordinator's work.

The evaluators were informed that the majority of coordinators visited homes regularly and assisted the guidance and teaching personnel in improving understanding between the parents and the school. Helping the family worker and community groups to provide clothing and health services added to the value of the coordinator's work. Most of the coordinators apparently knew their communities intimately.

Keeping parents informed of developments within the school and of services available in both school and community has been another effective function of the coordinator. Family workers and family assistants have helped to strengthen the work of the coordinators in the majority of schools. The coordinator, in almost all instances, appeared to be effective in maintaining the smoothness of school-community relationships by interpreting the school to the parents and the community at large, and in orienting the school to an understanding of the home and the family needs of the children in the neighborhood.

In the evaluators' opinion, the most effective community coordinators were those whose ethnic background matched that of the predominant part of the community. The work of the coordinator seemed to be approved, however, when he won the general acceptance of most of the community members. Youth and enthusiasm, together with knowledge of the neighborhood, seemed to be assets for the community coordinator.

Slowly, but effectively, the schools appeared to be bringing about desirable changes in attitudes and feelings in most of the communities. Community and parental involvement in the school programs seemed to be increasing. Still, the consensus of both teachers and administrative staff members is that strengthening in this area is needed.

CHAPTER 6

THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

The Curriculum

Although the curriculum in each of the More Effective Schools followed the city-wide guidelines, the content appeared to be constantly adjusted to meet the needs of the individual children at each grade level and to take community characteristics into account. Cooperative planning by teachers and supervisors, as well as by parents and members of the community, toward adjusting the curriculum to the community and to the pupils seemed to be an outstanding feature of the program. Curriculum changes and adjustments, in most cases, seemed to involve the correlation of information in various curriculum areas, or the inclusion of enrichment for the purpose of developing appreciations and understandings.

In some schools, programs of Afro-American culture were initiated and developed, with particular stress on art, music, and social studies. Similar enhancements and enrichment of subject content appear to have been developed in areas with predominantly Puerto Rican populations.

In several schools, a concerted effort had been made to study the cultural background of the predominant cultural group in the community and to incorporate the information gained into the school's social studies program. In many schools, emphasis was placed on the study of the community with the purpose of informing pupils about all phases of their immediate environment. As a by-product of this effort, representatives of groups and agencies within the community had been called upon to visit several of these schools and to speak to the pupils. This effort seemed to result not only in the enrichment of the curriculum, but also in a better community understanding of the objectives and programs of the schools.

Meetings of supervisors, specialists and cluster teachers on each grade level seemed to be effective in bringing about desirable curriculum adjustments. During these conferences, teachers discussed problems and asked questions about the content of instruction. Guidelines and suggestions for changes to solve the reported problems and meet the needs of the pupils seemed to be an outcome of these meetings.

Flexibility of content was emphasized in several schools, particularly in the areas of cultural enrichment and creative arts. In the schools visited, the most creative pupil work resulting from such enrichment seemed to be in the areas of creative writing and art.

Methods of Teaching

Apparently the greatest change in teaching methods in the More Effective Schools had been brought about through cooperative planning and "team" discussion. Better understanding and articulation of the various curriculum areas seem to have resulted from this approach.

Careful planning for instruction in the More Effective Schools was evidenced by the general atmosphere of the classrooms and the materials displayed on bulletin boards in these rooms. Planning was also obvious when teachers were presenting new material related to the previous day's lesson, and when they were preparing pupils for the material to be taught the following day. In general, previous, present, and future lesson content seemed to be closely articulated. Careful planning was also apparent during observations of independent group activities. Assignments for these activities showed careful consideration of the needs of individual pupils in a majority of cases.

Although most formal instruction seemed to be provided in standard or traditional lesson form, much use was made of individual, small-group, and team instruction methods in the More Effective Schools throughout the city. A conscious effort was made to provide for individual differences in instruction in a large majority of the classrooms visited. Many one-to-one relationships between pupil and teacher, with the respect for the individuality of the pupil being maintained, were observed. Unfavorable comparisons or identification of slower learners were obviously avoided. In general, the relaxed and not-too-formal, yet controlled, atmosphere of classes gave an impression of ample opportunity for the individual child to express himself freely and creatively. Recognition of the individuality of the child was also emphasized by the attitudes of teachers who seemed to know their children individually and worked with them on an individual basis.

"Busy work" was distinctly absent from almost all classes observed. In a majority of these classes, a concentrated effort by the teachers to develop attitudes of respect for others and self-control in the pupils was evident. In several classes, codes of behavior had been developed to inculcate in the students an appreciation for self-control, respect for the rights of others, responsibility, thoughtfulness, and initiative. Duty rosters, seen in some rooms, were used to develop understanding of duty and obligation, as well as a sense of pride in accomplishment.

Observation of several classes at the first, third and fifth-grade levels revealed obvious achievement in language arts and the development of social skills. Pupil participation in learning activities and oral discussion was impressive in a majority of the classrooms visited.

Instruction in reading was provided in all classes on a small-group basis, with two or three teachers in a single classroom. Groups were assembled homogeneously within the heterogenous class organization. In several cases a small "group" consisted of only one or two pupils. Cluster teachers seemed to be most helpful in providing help with reading in small groups. To many teachers and administrators, the cluster teacher seemed to be one of the most valuable contributions of the More Effective Schools program. During observations, it was apparent that cluster teachers were extremely helpful to other teachers in making good group-teaching and individual help possible. In some schools, the cluster teacher was used extensively for small-group instruction in corrective reading at the various grade levels, and also for individual corrective reading.

In some classes, the individualized approach to teaching reading was being used or had been adopted. This seemed to be prevalent where teachers gave evidence of understanding pupil problems and had extensive teaching experience. In most of the classrooms visited during reading lessons, many pupils were reading books on grade level. Reading materials for various levels were available in most classes.

Adjustments in methodology and grouping in other subject areas had been made in several schools. Several classes were using the Madison Plan in mathematics and the Minnesota Mathematics and Science Program. The teachers of these classes had been trained during the previous year and were permitted to implement the programs as they desired. In a number of schools, the Bank Street Program and the Senesh social studies materials were being used.

Pupil Interest and Participation

Pupils in ME schools seemed to be generally cheerful in their school activities throughout the day. An atmosphere of enthusiasm and excitement pervaded the school program. Pupils actively and eagerly participated in classroom work, play periods, and even drill periods, which are usually disliked by most pupils. They seemed to be motivated to succeed, and in most classroom situations rewards for good work were evident. Generous amounts of space were reserved in a majority of classrooms for a wide range of pupils' work. Material displayed was related to the subject matter being taught, and it illustrated the attention given to individual differences in interests and achievement. The pupils' colorful drawings and paintings, some of them depicting characters, gave evidence of desirable attitudes, creativity, and appreciation of varied ethnic backgrounds.

A general absence of "patterns" or formality in pupils' artwork was noticed. Work on display gave evidence of group and community activity. Displays in general were neat, and they seemed to be appreciated and respected by the children. In many classrooms, pupil motivation was obviously being developed through individual and class progress graphs in such areas as reading, mathematics, spelling, and language.

In a large majority of classes, pupils engaged in the planning, execution, and evaluation of work being done. In one typical lesson, in which a film on sex education was to be shown, pupils determined the information to be sought, watched for it, and then freely discussed it afterward. In another class, pupils had planned the steps in making a salad, made it, and then ate it.

Pupils seemed to work well individually or in small groups while the teacher worked with other individuals or groups. In several instances, pupils engaged in independent work gave evidence that they could carry out an independent project attentively and handle materials and procedures efficiently. In a majority of classes where materials were being handled, well-developed work habits were apparent. In this respect, teachers with some years of experience seemed to be more effective than younger teachers.

In almost every classroom, at all levels, an abundance of teaching materials such as books, charts, models and other objects were being used. Experiences obtained through trips, audiovisual aids, and outside speakers appeared to contribute to the overall variety of instruction.

Students in most instances entered classrooms informally, seemed to know what their next function was to be, and then proceeded to carry out the function. In a great number of classes observed, groups entered after a recess and continued work that had been under way. The business-like manner and tone of pupils in most classes showed that they had developed good work habits. Pupil interaction was predominant in almost all classrooms; yet the classes were, in general, well controlled, and teacher-pupil relationship seemed to be excellent. The most positive evidence of pupil growth, however, was the work habits and attitudes of pupils.

Behavior in MES seemed to be better in classrooms than in large group assemblies or activities, and seemed to be directly related to the quality of the lesson and the ability of the teacher. The majority of teachers observed, although limited in experience, seemed to be sincerely trying to do a good job.

Underachievers

Special attention was given to underachievers in each of the schools visited. In a majority of these, cluster teachers and teachers of corrective reading seemed to be making a concentrated effort not only to discover the underachiever, but also to solve his problems through individual instruction. Special curriculum and instructional materials were being developed for underachievers in some schools.

In several schools, the work of the corrective reading teacher was concentrated on a single grade level, which seemed to militate against discovery and help for pupils on a school-wide basis. Student teachers and apprentice teachers, as a part of their training, worked with individuals or small groups of underachievers during a part of each day. Some schools used the extended school day to provide extra help for these pupils. Special staff assignments were also made in some schools to give additional help to children who needed individual assistance. Cluster teachers, in many instances, served during preparation periods and during afternoon help sessions on a voluntary basis to extend the work with these pupils beyond the time limits of the regular school day and regular after-school sessions. Some reorganization of staff time to permit even greater individualization during certain parts of the day, and to reduce the number of staff members present in a single room at other times, seemed to be a general need.

In a further attempt to work with the underachiever, some schools had taken part in the Westinghouse Teacher Learning Center sponsored by their districts.

Grouping

The grouping patterns throughout the More Effective Schools were heterogeneous, but classes in all of these made some provision for homogeneity. All schools except one had special grouping arrangements for instruction in reading and mathematics to provide for greater homogeneity in teaching these subjects. All but seven schools reported that they had special homogeneous arrangements for teaching language. In no instance was the special grouping based on the ethnic backgrounds or social characteristics of pupils. In several schools, care had been taken to organize homeroom classes partially on the basis of achievement so that multiple grouping within instructional units would not be necessary.

Homogeneous grouping seemed to be preferred to heterogeneous grouping by some teachers because they saved preparation time and did not have to rearrange groups. This seemed to be predominantly true of teachers in upper-grade classes. Teachers in the lower grades, however, indicated a preference for heterogeneous grouping. Extreme ranges within classes seemed to present insurmountable problems for some teachers, however, and particularly for those with little experience. Where extreme ranges of ability led to problems in individual schools, adjustments in grouping were made.

In some schools, pupils were regrouped across grade levels for reading instruction. In others, pupils were regrouped for instruction in mathematics, although this did not seem to be a school-wide policy in most cases. Whenever regrouping was undertaken, the decision to do so appeared to be based on cooperative staff efforts and the desire of the staff to experiment with varied approaches. Often, where regrouping had been attempted, the evaluators found a cross-grade movement of pupils in grades 3 and 4, and 5 and 6, or an interchange of pupils in the other grades for developmental reading. Several teachers declared that this plan effectively met the needs of pupils on various levels and facilitated individual instruction.

Regrouping seemed to cause confusion and loss of time during the changing of groups. It also appeared to militate against the development of a feeling of security on the part of the poor reader who lacked self-confidence. A majority of teachers, however, expressed the thought that the many positive factors associated with homogeneous grouping more than offset the disadvantages and inconveniences.

In some schools, non-graded classes had been introduced in the first and second years, while regular groups on these grade levels had also been maintained. These non-graded classes in all cases were comprised of pupils 6 and 7 years old who had been selected on a heterogeneous basis. Such classes were kept as stable as possible, with no admissions or transfers being allowed during the year, so that the group size could be controlled and more individual instruction could be realized. This adjustment seemed to be profitable for slower second-year pupils in the beginning, but as the brighter first-year pupils progressed, the interest of the older and slower ones seemed to diminish. Pupils in some non-graded classes seemed to be doing better than those in regular groups, particularly on the first-grade level. Teachers seemed to be enthusiastic about the non-graded plan when comparing its beneficial characteristics with those of the regular class organization.

Pupil Population and Class Size

The enrollments in the ME schools range from about 800 to 1,500 pupils. Ethnically, pupils in these schools are predominantly of Negro or Puerto Rican background.

In spite of an extremely high rate of pupil mobility in some of the schools, the ethnic distribution of pupils in a majority of schools has remained rather constant over the last five years. Housing changes have not seemed to affect noticeably the ethnic composition of the schools, but apparently have had an effect on the appearance, dress, and attitudes of the children. Pupils in schools serving new housing developments seemed to be better dressed and to have a better attitude than those in other schools.

An influx of children from the West Indies, where the language is French, has taken place in some areas of the city. This population, although small, seems to be growing and to present an instructional problem in a few schools.

The ratio of pupils in a class to teachers before the MES program was instituted in the majority of schools was 32 to 1, as compared to the present range of 15 to 1 up to 22 to 1. The ratio of guidance counselors has also improved to the point where the pupil load of each counselor has been reduced to approximately one-third of its previous number.

School enrollments seemed to be too large for the sizes of the buildings in many instances. Although the program had provided additional services to help both the schools and the communities, these services seemed to be taxed to the utmost in areas where the schools were crowded. In some areas, district lines had been transgressed, either to follow MES guidelines, or to permit pupils to attend ME schools that had shrinking enrollments because of population shifts.

The high pupil-mobility rate complicated the evaluation of the MES program. Many pupils who begin in an ME school seem to be lost to the program by the end of the fifth grade. The chief causes of the high pupil-mobility rates seem to be the relocation of families in new housing developments, tenement fires, and the fear of living in an area because of hoodlumism or high narcotic use.

Pupils who had left schools that had predominantly Negro populations were generally replaced by pupils from the rural South. In schools where pupils were of predominantly Puerto Rican backgrounds, newcomers generally were other children from Puerto Rico, the South, or the West Indies. Pupils entering ME schools from other areas seemed to be generally below the achievement level of their new classes.

The high pupil-mobility rate also seemed to militate against continued development in academic attitudes, work habits, and behavior. In some schools, pupil mobility had apparently diminished considerably during the past two years. This may be partially caused by the efforts of parents to have their children remain in the MES program.

2

The extended school day, which was instituted during the 1968-69 school year, was reported to have caused "additional problems of lateness" in some schools. This, however, did not seem to be regarded as serious by most teachers and supervisors.

Control of Pupil Behavior

The nature of school control in a majority of More Effective Schools seemed to be determined by the administration's attitude toward pupil behavior, and by the attitudes of staff members toward the administration, each other, and the pupils. In general, the staffs maintained an attitude that was positive and conducive to a smooth educational process. Most of the MES teachers seemed to have practically eliminated problems of discipline in the classroom. This seemed to have been the result of keeping the children engaged in interesting activities.

The types of activities observed indicated that learning was taking place. The cooperative development of rules of conduct in many classrooms appeared to contribute to the pupils' desire to follow acceptable routine procedures. In many cases, although teachers seemed capable in classrooms, a loss of control in activities outside of the classroom was noticeable.

Displays on corridor bulletin boards and tables in most of the schools remained undamaged. Individual classrooms were also very attractive, and they seemed to reflect pupil interest in classwork and in caring for their rooms.

Teachers apparently understood individual pupils, and did not make unrealistic demands of them. Self-discipline seemed to be the goal. Those teachers who had created a challenging and interesting classroom environment seemed to be most successful in maintaining a learning situation without conflicts. In most classrooms, pupils were constantly engaged in worthwhile activities. No sustained period of pupil inactivity was observed in any of the classes visited.

Control of student behavior was apparently more difficult in old buildings that seemed to be inadequate for the MES program than in newer and more spacious structures. In a few buildings, pupils were crowded into small areas for lunch, gymnasium and play space were limited, and corridors were narrow. In a majority of these situations, the noise of children talking or at play was not diminished by soundproofing. In some older schools that had no public address system, communication needed for control often appeared to be difficult.

Administrative suspensions in MES were almost non-existent. However, a small number of principals' suspensions took place during the year in most schools. In schools where the MES program had been in effect since 1964, a definite decrease in suspensions of all types was reported. Teachers and supervisors seemed to agree that the MES program had caused a positive change in the number and the nature of behavior problems in the schools.

Some schools appeared to need a pattern of control over the passage of pupils through corridors and lunchrooms, and in other situations that led to social interaction and free movement. This appeared to be more prevalent where younger teachers predominated. Although teachers were generally alert to undesirable school behavior, most of them maintained school control with a pleasant attitude of personal interest. However, where undue pressure was applied by the staff through constant attention to strict control rather than to desirable pupil activity, a feeling of tension could be detected. Schools where strict controls were being enforced seemed to have a greater deviation from expected behavior.

Disruptive pupils in More Effective Schools were referred to guidance counselors and assistant principals. In a majority of cases, the individual pupil appeared to be known by staff members and was referred to the one who might best understand his problems.

In general, control procedures as well as preventive or corrective measures, were determined individually by each school. In one school, with the cooperation of parents, the staff had developed routine procedures for handling special disciplinary cases. These procedures were outlined in chart form to indicate the line of referral and the type of action to be taken for each of several types of behavior. Most of the other schools did not seem to have a specific plan for handling behavior problems, except for the usual chain of referral--from teacher to guidance counselor, to home, and to a supervisor. In several schools, one or more special guidance classes had been instituted to ease the burden of school control.

One of the most salutary indications of the effectiveness of school control was the limited amount of vandalism that was visible in most ME schools and in their surroundings.

Teacher-Training

Because of the limited experience of the teaching staff, the special aspects of the MES program, and the teacher turnover in some schools that led to the assignment of teachers without experience, many principals and assistant principals seemed to think that the development of an in-service training program was of extreme importance. They agreed that much of this training should be concentrated during the beginning months of the school year.

Despite this recognition of the need, little training was provided on a centralized basis, other than limited in-service orientation and workshop sessions on a district level. The workshop sessions were primarily concerned with individual curriculum areas, methods of teaching, and problems of the disadvantaged. Special courses sponsored by outside agencies were given in some schools. Where these courses were offered, the staff seemed to be interested and to become involved.

Most of the teacher training in the MES program was done by the assistant principals and staff specialists, with assistant principals acting as coordinators of the training program in most cases. In some schools, the assignment of an assistant principal as a teacher-trainer has become a practice because of the constant help and consistent follow-up assistance that inexperienced teachers need.

In some schools, an elaborate program supplemented regular faculty, supervisors, and grade-level meetings. Such programs included beginning-of-the-year orientation meetings, demonstration lessons for individuals and groups, after-school curriculum and grade-level workshops, intercultural seminars to develop understanding of the neighborhood and pupil backgrounds, and special conferences on needs of pupils and the community.

Several administrators considered the general faculty meetings, grade-level meetings, meetings of teachers with cluster teachers, meetings of teachers with specialists, and subject-area meetings an important part of the in-service teacher-training program. Almost all of these meetings were held during the school day. A majority of teachers seemed to think that the training offered was worthwhile.

In almost all schools, supervisors held regular meetings with cluster teachers and with specialists. Supervisors also made a distinct effort to involve teachers and other staff members in planning facets of the program, solving mutual problems, and enlisting the services of specialists, master teachers, and those who knew the community in the training sessions.

The work of special teacher trainers seemed to be of definite value in those schools to which they had been assigned. One of the most meaningful outcomes of the training offered by various schools was the cooperative attitude that seemed to develop as a result of the effort that the assistant principals put forth in this program.

CHAPTER 7

BUILDINGS, FACILITIES, MATERIALS, AND SUPPLIES

A majority of the buildings that housed ME schools were modern and well-suited for the MES program. Some, however, lacked rooms that could be used for small-group instruction, meetings, and consultation. Office space and facilities to accommodate the many services of the MES program were also lacking in some schools. Many of the staff members in these schools said that their work was not as effective as it should have been because of these space deficiencies.

Older buildings housing ME schools were, in some instances, more adaptable to small-group instruction because the large classrooms lent themselves to grouping within rooms and to a team-teaching approach. In general, however, the rooms and facilities in the older buildings were not readily adaptable to the program, in spite of renovations and re-arrangements of space. These buildings did not have the wide corridors, good lighting, cheerful appearance, and features for maintaining cleanliness that characterized the newer buildings. One of these buildings was greatly in need of repair and did not seem to provide an atmosphere that was in keeping with MES objectives.

Gymnasium and Play Space

Gymnasium and play space was limited in some buildings and their surrounds. In one building, two classrooms had been converted into a health-education room, which seemed to be totally inadequate. Other buildings had limited space inside, and a minimum of play space outside for kindergarten children. In the newer buildings, indoor gymnasium and play space appeared to be generally adequate; however, outdoor play space had been reduced in several schools through the erection of portable buildings to accommodate a growing enrollment.

Auditoriums

Auditoriums in the newer buildings were generally large enough to accommodate a large segment of the school enrollment and appeared to be reasonably well suited to the school activities. Assembly space in older buildings, however, seemed to be of dubious value because of poor visibility, poor acoustics, and limited seating capacity. These auditoriums were poorly lighted, gloomy, and unappealing.

Rooms for Special Purposes

Although a majority of the schools seemed to have adequate space for meetings of neighborhood groups, administrators in two schools said that they needed additional space for this purpose.

Teachers' rooms in most schools were inadequate for either working in groups or for comfortable conversation. In general, they were small, dingy, dimly lighted, inadequately furnished, and poorly kept. These rooms were not conducive to the development of enthusiasm or high morale. In several cases, the teachers' room was shared by a specialist, who used it for an office. In one school, teachers had volunteered the use of their room for small-group instruction in reading.

Medical rooms in at least three buildings were used during part of the day as office space for other services.

Classrooms

In several of the More Effective Schools, additional space seemed to be needed because of an increase in registers at the lower grade levels. These increased registers threatened to deprive, or were depriving, some children of the MES program at the sixth-grade level. Space in a nearby housing development was being used for some of the children in one school program. It was obvious that overcrowding was beginning to be a problem in several schools, and that adjustments would soon be needed to maintain the program in accordance with MES guidelines.

Libraries

Library facilities in all schools seemed to be at least adequate. In the majority of schools, the libraries were pleasant, well-lighted, well-furnished, and sufficiently large. Some principals of the ME schools described the libraries as one of the most desirable characteristics of the program. Almost without exception, librarians praised the More Effective Schools program because its expanded staff permitted greater freedom in developing a regular schedule of library use. This included meetings of classes, teachers, parents, and, quite often, members of the community. An abundance of reading material provided by the program also seems to have encouraged greater use of the libraries. Almost all libraries circulated 800 to 1,000 books a month. A majority of the librarians reported that they distributed more than one book per student to classrooms on a weekly basis. Borrowing by individuals and classes was generally encouraged in all schools. In most schools, each pupil was required to take home at least one book a week.

In addition to an ample supply of regular reading material, each of the libraries seemed to have excellent and varied research materials. During the evaluators' observations, libraries were being used by pupils for individual research, by small groups, and by scheduled classes. Active borrowing of books for class use was also evident in each of the schools. Several librarians reported that use of the library had increased and improved under the MES program.

Library facilities were supplemented by an attractive display of books available for pupil use in each classroom visited.

A need for more children's books in Spanish was apparent in schools that had a large number of pupils with Puerto Rican backgrounds. The only other major need noted was for more library work-room space in some schools.

Cafeterias and Lunchrooms

Cafeterias and lunchrooms in a majority of schools, particularly in the newer buildings, seemed to be satisfactory and, in most cases, were clean at the beginning of the school day. In most instances, facilities in the older buildings were inadequate and not conducive to the development of a desirable attitude toward school, society, or self. The location of a cafeteria in a dark basement, the absence of sound-absorbing ceilings, and crowding were among the unfortunate features of one school. Because of limited size of the lunchroom, staggered lunch periods for various grade levels were initiated in one school.

Several of the school cafeterias were supervised by assistant principals. Teachers and school aides supervised this area in several of the schools.

Condition of Plant

School administrators, teachers, staff, parents, and custodial personnel seemed to be aware of the importance of a desirable school environment. The maintenance of a pleasant school atmosphere was conducive to the accomplishment of MES objectives.

Buildings housing MES programs were generally clean and in good repair, except for the two older buildings that needed major repairs.

Rooms and corridors, in general, gave evidence of a conscious effort on the part of the custodial staffs to maintain equipment and to keep buildings clean. Practically all the classrooms visited were neat and orderly, and had ample signs of teacher interest and planning. In a few schools, papers on the floor in corridors and in classrooms suggested a need for developing greater pride in school membership and habits of neatness and cleanliness on the part of pupils.

Community cooperation in caring for school property was less than optimal in some of the neighborhoods. Outside damage, markings on school walls and doors, and broken windows detracted from the appearance of several of the schools.

Vandalism, theft, and the entrance of outsiders into buildings also seemed to be detrimental to the program in some schools. Minor damage and markings on bulletin boards and in corridors were evident in some schools. Theft of audiovisual aid equipment was reported by some principals to be particularly harmful to the program. Teachers in some schools said that outsiders had been responsible for the theft of their own personal property. Constant surveillance seemed to be necessary in some schools.

Instructional Materials and Supplies

Each school seemed to have an abundance and variety of supplies, materials, and instructional equipment. A majority of administrators and teachers said that the supplies had been "more than adequate," and that the allotment of funds had been generous, allowing the principals to order many training materials not previously available. In most schools, no complaint was made about any supplies. In other schools, principals claimed that they needed additional funds.

Both teachers and supervisors expressed the opinion that an abundance of materials in the More Effective Schools increased the feasibility of extending the curriculum beyond the normal range of subject matter and creative opportunities. Some principals pointed out, however, that the per-pupil allowance for supplies and materials was not being maintained, and difficulties are consequently being encountered in replacing books and materials with newer and more appropriate publications.

Some teachers and supervisors reported that the supplies and materials provided through MES funds had permitted almost unlimited opportunities for experimentation and creativity. The funds also enabled teachers and pupils to make instructional and recreational aids and displays. Pupil-made charts, three-dimensional science and mathematics models, art projects, and toys were generally attractive and were in evidence in each of the schools.

Teacher-made instructional charts were also on display in a majority of the rooms visited. The attractiveness of many of the classrooms and corridors was enhanced through good use of the many available supplies in constructing illustrative displays and in decorating bulletin boards.

Instructional materials including reference, text, and supplemental books. Commercially-prepared charts, maps, teaching boards, educational toys, and games were also in evidence in each of the schools. Classroom libraries seemed to be well-supplied with books on a variety of subjects and on several reading levels. Puzzles, games, dolls, and puppets were also evident in many classrooms.

The provision of urban related materials has apparently increased greatly during recent years. In some instances, teachers had developed reading materials based on the pupils' recent experiences in order to individualize reading instruction.

Several of the rooms visited had "science corners," in which plants, animals, terrariums, and aquariums had been made a regular part of the classroom equipment.

Each school seemed to be sufficiently well-equipped with audiovisual aids and equipment to provide a strong audiovisual instructional program. Principals, in general, claimed that "everything that is needed in the way of audiovisual equipment has been provided." They apparently had little difficulty obtaining this equipment.

In each of the schools, the evaluators saw tapes, recorders, records, record-players, film-strip projectors, overhead projectors, motion picture projectors, television sets, and AM-FM radios. In several classrooms, an AM-FM radio was a part of the regular classroom equipment and was constantly available for instructional use. Vandalism and theft, however, had caused damage and loss to equipment in some schools. Principals in these schools complained that replacement of stolen or damaged equipment was difficult and slow. All the principals reported that the initial supply of these materials was good, but that funds for maintenance and repair were not readily obtained.

In a majority of the schools, an audiovisual aids coordinator supplied audiovisual equipment to teachers, arranged for its storage and repair, and helped with the scheduling and use of this equipment in individual classes. Audiovisual aids coordinators in several schools also instructed the staff in the use of various types of equipment, and assisted the teachers in using these aids in the classroom.

SECTION III

INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION FINDINGS IN THE CONTROL SCHOOLS

CHAPTER 8

CONTROL SCHOOLS: INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION FINDINGS

Each control school was visited at least twice to compare its activities and instructional programs with those in the More Effective Schools. Evaluators interviewed members of the staff at each level of administration and in each phase of the teaching program. At least five classes in each school were observed. The evaluators were impressed by the sincere efforts that were being exerted in all the control schools to give the children the best instruction possible with the staff, materials, and facilities available. These eight schools were Special Service schools.

The School and the Community

In general, the relations between the control schools and the neighborhoods they served were fairly good, and the efforts that were being made to improve these relations were varied and sincere. However, at each point of contact, the control schools seemed to be a little weaker than the ME schools.

Parent Activities and Attitudes

Parents who were interviewed seemed to be in favor of the programs that were being offered, but not as enthusiastically as parents of children in the ME schools. Some parents complained that ME schools had been provided with desirable services that were not available in the control schools. In the majority of cases, however, they were generally satisfied and were pleased with the education being given their children.

In two of the schools, the principals reported that they themselves were products of the neighborhood and personally knew many of the parents. One principal was of the same nationality background as one of the predominant groups in his school. His school appeared to have an extremely active parent group, a variety of parent activities, and generally active community participation in school affairs. Traditionally, the attitudes of parents in this area has been good.

Parents in some of the control schools actively participated in field trips and theatrical events. In a few of the schools, parents cooperated in curriculum revision and in developing curriculum materials for several subject areas. These activities were concentrated mainly on Afro-American cultural content. However, parents in one school were preparing a special dictionary for the students, and about 30 parents in another school were participating actively in an evening workshop on school topics, conducted by teachers and specialists on the staff.

In the main, the parents' activities and programs in the control schools did not match those in the ME schools in number, size, or variety. Parents apparently had not shown sufficient interest to justify the maintenance of a parents' room in most of the control schools.

Parent Association Activities

As was the case in the ME schools, parent associations seemed to be limited in their scope to work that could be done by a relatively small number of interested parents. These were the ones who attended a majority of meetings and bore most of the responsibilities. Although one school had an average of more than 50 persons at its meetings, attendance in the similar sessions at other control schools was usually from 15 to 25. This was fewer than was typical of the MES associations. Teachers did not seem to be active in most control-school parent associations.

Community Relations

The efforts of the school staffs and parents to stimulate community interest in the schools were obviously sincere and broad in scope. These endeavors, however, did not seem to be as strongly motivated as those in the ME schools. The problems faced by the control schools and their communities created difficulties in developing community-school relationships that could not be fully resolved by the limited staffs. No control school had a community coordinator designated as such, but each school had assigned a teacher or other member of the staff to perform a coordinator's duties. In most cases, this function was in addition to other duties. Although the relationship between members of the community and the schools seemed smooth, articulation with the community usually could not be maintained to the same extent as was possible in the ME schools with their special community coordinators.

The School Staff

Interviews conducted in control schools for the purpose of getting opinions of school personnel focused on the effectiveness of the educational programs in areas of most concern. These interviews yielded information which was useful in evaluating the features of the More Effective Schools Program.

Interviews with Principals

All of the control school principals were interviewed, and all of them expressed the belief that their schools were providing an effective program for their children. They maintained that achievement was about as high in the control schools as in the ME schools. They did suggest, however, that because their schools were Special Service schools, they were able to provide educational services beyond those which were offered in regular schools without these additional services. The principals reported that positions had been added to their schools, and non-teaching duties of teachers had thereby been reduced considerably.

All the principals reported that only a small percentage of their staffs had left the school system or transferred to other schools during the 1968-69 school year. According to the principals, neither teacher mobility nor the replacement of teachers during the school year was a problem. All the teachers who had left had been replaced. As was the case for the ME schools and for the city schools in general, the main reasons for the loss of teachers were moving out of the city, marriage, and maternity.

Each principal reported that he was pleased with the staff in his school. A majority said that training new teachers while maintaining the school program was difficult with a limited staff.

Although principals in ME schools in general had reported that subject specialists very substantially improved pupil performance, principals in control schools varied in their appraisal of specialists' services. Most of these principals said that specialists contributed a good deal to the education of the children.

Several principals stressed the need for qualified and licensed assistant principals. One school had three acting assistants.

Several principals said that they would welcome the MES program in their schools, but that they would not have sufficient space for it.

Interviews with Assistant Principals

In each of the schools, at least one assistant principal was interviewed. All of them reported that they had supervised extensively, and had assisted teachers in planning their programs. This was substantiated in interviews with teachers and by observations. The interviews and observations clearly showed that assistant principals were quite active in the overall supervision of student behavior in the schools and in the ongoing training of teachers. Several assistant principals reported that they had actively participated in the supervision of lunchrooms, playgrounds, entrance halls, and dismissal areas. Each of these assistants said that he was the first to be called upon for help in problems of behavior.

All the assistant principals indicated that their schools had orientation programs for new teachers, while five of the eight said they had special teacher-trainer positions. In seven of the schools, demonstration teaching programs were carried on by the assistant principals and experienced staff members to help new teachers adjust to instructional programs. A majority of the schools were conducting in-service courses during the time of the evaluators' visits. Assistant principals in three of the eight schools reported that some teachers in their schools had taken advantage of tuition-free courses in local colleges.

All but two of the control schools assisted local colleges in student-teacher training. As with the ME schools, very limited relationships have been established with colleges on curriculum development, research and evaluation, and program development.

Interviews with Teachers

Teachers seemed to be generally satisfied with the programs in their schools. They did say, however, that they could use additional help in areas such as mathematics and reading. A majority of the teachers appeared to be interested in their teaching programs and dedicated to doing a good job.

Several specialists reported that their work loads were extremely heavy, and that more could be accomplished in their fields if additional specialists of their types could be assigned to the schools.

Some staff members in the control schools expressed a desire for increased personnel to reduce the class size and to facilitate the development of a better program of instruction in some subject areas. Several teachers expressed an interest in improving their instructional methods, and they praised their supervisors for their efforts related to this goal.

Most of the teachers said that the attitudes of the pupils in these schools were unusually good, but that many children reflected parental indifference to what the school was doing. The children of parents who did care were almost always interested and enthusiastic.

Interviews With Guidance Counselors

Each of the nine guidance counselors interviewed said that additional help would permit the development of a program of individual interviewing and discovery, which was not possible under the existing circumstances. Each of them complained that some of their time was used in crisis counseling, although several said that most of this burden was borne by the assistant principals. The counselors frequently mentioned their need for adequate office space. In one school, guidance counselors had to use part of a teachers' lunchroom and had no privacy. Most counselors reported that little space was available for small-group conferences, and that it was difficult to conduct confidential meetings with privacy. The control schools had a limited number of guidance counselors, so that the pupil load per counselor was heavier than in MES. In the absence of a team of guidance specialists, the full burden of counseling the entire student body fell on the counselors alone. Nevertheless, each counselor had made community contacts with social agencies, medical clinics, and special psychiatric and psychological services to help pupils adjust to both society and the school program.

Interviews With Paraprofessionals

Paraprofessionals and school aides, in explaining their duties, were cognizant of their roles in the overall operation of their schools. Each seemed to know his or her job, and understood its duties and functions. They did not, however, appear to be impressed with the programs in their schools. Most of them said that they appreciated what the schools were trying to do for the children, and they themselves were attempting to enhance the smooth and efficient operation of the educational program. As in the ME schools, these aides explained that they helped to maintain order in the building and classrooms, assisted teachers in distributing and collecting materials, prepared materials, helped children with clothing, and proctored moving groups.

The Instructional Program

The curriculum of the control schools was based on the bulletins developed for use with children in New York City schools in general. Each school, however, tried to adjust its programs and curriculum content to meet the individual needs of its pupils. Although these schools tended to adhere closely to the suggested curriculum content, they also conducted an enrichment program for the ethnic groups represented by their pupils. Extensive enrichment was also noted in several classes composed of children with high intellectual ability.

In most of the classes where a definite attempt at enrichment was being made through historical and cultural information pertaining to the predominant ethnic group in the school, reading material had been carefully chosen for that purpose. Bulletin boards and displays gave evidence of concentrated efforts in the same direction.

Methods of Teaching

Methods of teaching in the control schools seemed to be more traditional in nature and more formal in tone than they were in the experimental schools. Some small-group work was being undertaken, particularly in first-grade classes. In the upward progression of the grades, teaching in small groups became less evident, and learning was typically more passive than active.

Less difference between the ME and control schools was apparent at the first-grade level than at any other grade observed. The teacher-pupil ratios in the control and ME schools were almost the same in the first grade because additional personnel assigned to the Special Service schools were concentrated at that grade level. Two teachers had been assigned to virtually all the first-grade classes. Several student-teachers also served these classes. More materials to fit the needs of individual children were being prepared at this level than in the upper grades. Commercial materials, too, seemed to be used effectively, with teachers giving careful explanations and following through. Pupil behavior problems rarely appeared at the first-grade level.

Good work habits were stressed in most classrooms. In several, the approach to teaching did not seem to be creative, nor did it provide sufficient opportunity for developing critical thinking and practicing clear expression in daily living situations. Much of the workbook-type material was directed toward test orientation rather than toward the broader aims of teaching.

Pupil work that was displayed in the lower-grade classrooms represented a variety of curriculum areas, and emphasized children's original work. Work exhibited at the higher grade levels, however, seemed to reflect the students' performance on teacher-prepared texts and exercise materials, which indicated a more formal instructional setting. In all the classrooms, displays of pupil work seemed to be used advantageously as a reward and motivational technique. Team teaching was employed in only a few of the lessons observed throughout the grades.

Rapport between teachers and pupils was very good in almost all the classes. The control schools rated as high as the ME schools in this area because they had more experienced teachers, at least in the classes observed, and because a substantial proportion (36%) of the control-school classes visited were at the first-grade level, with two full-time teachers in each.

Supervisors held grade and individual conferences with teachers in each of the schools to help them adjust the curriculum and instructional methods to the needs of the community and the pupils being taught. Each school had extra programs related to both instruction and community concerns. As in MES, these activities were marked by variety, without noticeable effort toward correlation other than in the after-school study program, Head Start, the summer elementary school, and the vacation day-camp. All the school plants were used for some type of out-of-school program. All but two schools had summer programs.

Some of the best teaching observed was in the upper-ability classes of the control schools, but the atmosphere in the classes comprised of slow learners was usually dismal. Although these classes had small registers, they were pervaded by passivity, lack of interest, and a feeling of "just passing time." This appeared to be true in almost every low-ability classroom where brighter students were not present to stimulate the others.

In several classes, objective workbook materials, with short-answer questions in each section, were being used.

In general, the pupils seemed to be interested in their school work, and they participated in classroom activities, but more passively and routinely than in the ME schools.

As in the ME schools, special attention and instruction were given to under-achievers whenever possible. Usually these children were grouped together, and then helped on an individual basis. The size of the classes, however, appeared to militate against individual instruction, and some teachers seemed to be having difficulty in working with individuals or small groups in a large class.

The observers noted that the teachers in most of the control schools did not have many non-teaching duties, but they were not as well off as the ME teachers in this respect.

Grouping

Approximately one-third of the classes observed were heterogeneously grouped. Both heterogeneously and homogeneously grouped classes were usually divided into smaller groups for the purpose of individualizing instruction as much as possible in the lower grades. At the fifth-grade level, classes were generally taught as entire units, rather than as groups within classes.

All the schools had arranged special grouping for reading instruction, but only three had done so for mathematics. Grouping for instruction on the basis of language ability or language difficulty was observed in several schools. Neither the ME nor control schools arranged groups on the basis of ethnic backgrounds or social development or adjustment. Special classes in both types of schools provided for the care of atypical children.

Some teachers were hampered in giving individual or small-group assistance because their attention was needed by those not receiving instruction. Maintaining order during these periods did not seem to be a problem in the ME schools. As indicated previously, the classes composed of the more able pupils in the upper grades seemed to be interested and active, but other classes made up of poorer students were disinterested and lethargic.

Class Size

Several of the classes observed in the grade range of 1-6 had registers of more than 22 pupils, and some had as many as 28. However, absences sometimes reduced these classes substantially. In large classes, small-group work and individual instruction were difficult to manage, if not practically impossible, which accounted for the fact that large-group instruction prevailed in most classrooms. In the larger classes, discipline problems seemed to be numerous, and they were disturbing for both the teacher and the students. Many teachers in these situations spent more time in maintaining order than in teaching. Improvement in oral language was also more difficult in the larger classes because relatively seldom did every pupil have a chance to speak during a class discussion.

Pupil Mobility

The control schools had taken special steps to attempt to reduce pupil mobility, except for one that apparently was not faced with this problem. In each of the other schools, the principals and those in charge of student enrollment reported that some progress had been made toward alleviating this problem. Both the control schools and the ME schools bussed a small number of physically or mentally handicapped children to school each day. None of the control schools reported bussing any sizable number of pupils daily for open enrollment, which was being done by one ME school.

Pupil Behavior

Control of pupil behavior appeared to be a major problem in a number of the control schools. While the types of misbehavior in the ME and control schools were similar, the attitudes of children toward each other and toward authority differed, with less fear and more understanding being shown by pupils in the ME schools.

The treatment of behavior problems seemed to be more superficial in the control schools. While services of various types were often applied to the solution of each individual problem in the ME schools, only limited help of this kind was available in the control schools, where the assistant principal seemed to be the first and major source in crisis cases. Disciplinary measures tended to be more formal in the control schools than in the ME schools. Large class size appeared to contribute to the difficulty in controlling some pupils.

Also, the dark and lifeless corridors, cafeterias, and auditoriums of the older buildings contributed difficulties to maintaining order. Movement in corridors, although generally orderly, was sometimes noisy and disturbing to children in the classrooms. In a few of the schools visited, attractive and informative bulletin boards and displays in corridors had been damaged by obviously deliberate vandalism.

As in the ME schools, only a comparatively few pupils had been suspended during the school year, but the number seemed to be somewhat larger in the control schools.

Most of the control schools apparently had no special referral procedures for difficult cases. The guidance program in a few schools tended to be crisis-centered, rather than constructive. Physical conditions in some schools militated against individual counseling services for pupils with problems. In some schools, however, an atmosphere of professional guidance and flexible control did seem to prevail.

Teaching Materials and Supplies

Most of the administrators and teachers said that teaching materials and books were plentiful, and they had no complaints on that score. The adequacy of instructional materials was confirmed by the evaluators' observations. Library supplies also seemed to be excellent. Some members of the teaching staff, however, reported slight delays in receiving back orders. Although these control schools had sufficient audiovisual teaching aides, these were not as readily available to the classroom teachers, nor were they seen in use as much, in the control schools as in the ME schools.

The Buildings

Most control schools were in older buildings that were void of many advantages found in the newer buildings that housed most of the ME schools. Office space in these older buildings was limited, and special services consequently were difficult to administer. A program such as MES could hardly be instituted in the control-school buildings without reducing the pupil enrollment.

The most critical need was for classroom space. Some schools, because of overcrowding, used portable classrooms, and converted large areas such as gymnasiums into classrooms. Others had found space in community centers and other neighborhood buildings. At least three of the schools also needed more space for small-group conferences. Recreational facilities seemed to be at a premium, too.

In general, the classrooms were well equipped with bulletin boards, shelves, and cabinet space, except for some of the rooms in the oldest buildings. Classrooms in these structures, although generally clean, and brightened by the display of pupil materials, did not have an atmosphere that was conducive to creativity or learning. Lack of movable furniture in several classrooms was a deterrent to small-group activities.

Space restrictions also handicapped the development of a complete program of school services in most of the control schools. Work in several of those observed was hampered because a single office had to be occupied by several staff members, each performing different functions.

Library space seemed to be satisfactory in the control schools, but some did not have adequate room for preparing and storing library material. In general, the libraries did not seem to be as bright and cheerful, or as actively used, as they were in the ME schools. In several control schools, gymnasium and play space was extremely limited. Portable classroom buildings had reduced playground space in some cases.

SECTION IV

RECORDED DATA, TEST RESULTS, QUESTIONNAIRE FINDINGS AND SUPERINTENDENTS' VIEWS

CHAPTER 9

RECORDED DATA

Salient statistics that are helpful in making an accurate evaluation of the MES program are presented in this chapter. They deal with both the ME and control schools, and offer certain significant comparisons with the program in previous years.

Most of the data for 1968-69 were drawn from records at the headquarters of the Board of Education, through channels designated by the Bureau of Educational Research. The Office of Planning, Programming and Budgeting provided data on expenditures, average class size, and pupil-teacher ratios for 1968-69. The statistics on average register, attendance, and pupil mobility for 1965-66 (Table 6) were taken from the Bureau's 1966 report, "Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program." Information on the 1966-67 average class size, pupil-teacher ratio, per-pupil costs, and ethnic backgrounds (Tables 1,4,5,8) are from the 1967 report by the Center for Urban Education, "Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program." These two reports provided all the quoted statistics on the operation of the program in previous years.

Additional figures for the current year were obtained from principals, assistant principals, and school records during the evaluators' visits to the schools in June, 1969.

In comparing the 1968-69 program with former MES operations, two different years were used because the two earlier evaluation reports were not equally complete on every point. Either 1965-66 or 1966-67 was therefore used as the basis for comparison--depending on which afforded the closer parallel to the 1968-69 data.

The statistics in this chapter will be taken up again later in the report, when each of the main specifications in the project's guidelines will be discussed separately. Meanwhile, it should be kept in mind that statistical information does not tell the whole story of the More Effective Schools, nor of the control schools used for purposes of comparison. Furthermore, the statistics often are susceptible to more than one interpretation. The text that accompanies each of the tables gives the highlights as seen by the evaluators.

School Size

School size, in terms of pupil enrollment, was more favorable for effective instruction in ME schools than for the control schools. With the exception of one ME school, which did not have pupils above the second grade, pupil enrollment ranged from 718 to 1,391 (Table 11). Five of the ME schools had registers below 800, and eight exceeded 1,000. Only 2 of the 18 had more than 1,200 pupils enrolled.

Enrollment in the eight control schools, on the other hand, ranged from 764 pupils in one to 2,735 in another. The school with 764 pupils was the only control school with an enrollment below 800. The enrollment in four of the eight control schools exceeded 1,200.

Average Class Size and Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The Board of Education computes average class size by dividing the pupil register by the number of organized classes in a school. Table 1 shows that the average class size had not changed substantially between 1966 and 1968 in the More Effective Schools, the citywide elementary schools, or the Special Service schools, but the control schools showed a decrease of 2.5 pupils per class. Both the citywide elementary schools and the Special Service schools reflected a slight decrease of 0.9, which indicates some success in reducing class size in these schools. The reductions have been accomplished mainly through the Enhanced Primary Program, which improves the teacher-pupil ratio in the lower grades. Some control schools had two full-time teachers in the primary level classrooms. This type of staffing effort was illustrated by the fact that the average class size at the first-grade level for MES was 19.9, and for control schools, 21.8 (Table 2).

TABLE 1

Average Class Size and Pupil-Teacher Ratio in Elementary Grades
(1966 and 1968 Comparisons)

	Average Class Size		Pupil-Teacher Ratio	
Type of School	October 1966	December 1968	October 1966	December 1968
More Effective	20.1	20.2	12.3	11.6
Control	28.5	26.0	22.2	19.3
City-wide Elementary	27.7	26.8	21.9	20.8
Special Service	27.2	26.3	20.9	18.8

TABLE 2

Number of Students, Number of Classes, and Average Class Size--Grades 1-6--As of December 17, 1968

Eight ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1964

	Number of Students							Number of Classes							Average Class Size						
	Grade						Total	Grade						Total	Grade						Total
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	1-6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1-6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1-6
83M	134	146	142	142	122	127	813	7	8	7	6	5	6	39	19.1	18.3	20.3	23.7	24.4	21.2	20.8
100M	177	195	181	168	157		878	8	9	9	8	8		42	22.1	21.7	20.1	21.0	19.6		20.9
154M	127	105	103	117	101	126	679	6	6	5	6	5	6	34	21.2	17.5	20.6	20.2	21.0	21.0	20.0
1X	225	204	163	150	162	118	1022	16	14	10	7	8	6	61	14.1	14.6	16.3	21.4	20.3	19.7	16.8
120K	219	180	177	148	154		878	9	8	8	7	8		40	24.3	22.5	22.1	21.1	19.3		22.0
138K	245	232	247	193	199		1116	14	11	12	10	10		57	17.5	21.1	20.6	19.3	19.9		19.6
40Q	180	186	155	168	147		836	9	9	7	8	7		40	20.0	20.7	22.1	21.0	21.0		20.9
18R	155	128	116	110	115	117	741	8	6	6	6	5	5	36	19.4	21.3	19.3	18.3	23.0	23.4	20.6
All Old MES	1462	1376	1284	1196	1157	488	6963	77	71	64	58	56	23	349	19.0	19.4	20.1	20.6	20.7	21.2	20.0
Ten ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1965																					
11M	109	98	108	89	86		490	5	5	5	4	4		23	21.8	19.6	21.6	22.3	21.5		21.3
146M	139	126	102	131	136	125	759	6	6	5	6	6	6	35	23.2	21.0	20.4	21.8	22.7	20.8	21.7
168M	117	144	129	119	109	109	727	7	7	7	7	5	5	38	16.7	20.6	18.4	17.0	21.8	21.8	19.1
110X	186	153	154	143	146		782	9	7	8	7	7		38	20.7	21.9	19.3	20.4	20.9		20.6
41K	142	122	139	110	106		619	7	8	9	6	5		35	20.3	15.3	15.4	18.3	21.2		17.7
80K	170	169					339	7	8					15	24.3	21.1					22.6
165K	128	147	111	118	97		601	6	6	5	5	4		26	21.3	24.5	22.2	23.6	24.3		23.1
307K	141	111	82	81	86	63	564	7	5	4	4	4	3	27	20.1	22.2	20.5	20.3	21.5	21.0	20.9
183Q	144	153	115	130	116	129	787	7	8	6	6	6	6	39	20.6	19.1	19.2	21.7	19.3	21.5	20.2
31R	128	95	95	82	90	83	573	6	5	4	4	5	4	28	21.3	19.0	23.8	20.5	18.0	20.8	20.5
All New MES	1404	1318	1035	1003	972	509	6241	67	65	53	49	46	24	304	21.0	20.3	19.6	20.5	21.2	21.2	20.5
All MES	2866	2694	2319	2199	2129	997	13204	144	136	117	107	102	47	653	19.9	19.8	19.8	20.6	20.9	21.2	20.2
Eight CONTROL Schools																					
144M	118	118	105	86	92	111	630	6	5	4	3	3	4	25	19.7	23.6	26.3	28.7	30.7	27.8	25.2
161M	198	206	217	212	173	181	1187	13	7	8	7	6	6	47	15.2	29.4	27.1	30.3	28.8	30.2	25.3
29X	462	526	409	414	405	110	2326	17	20	14	14	13	4	82	27.2	26.3	29.2	29.6	31.2	27.5	28.4
167K	279	292	270	238	202		1281	8	10	10	9	7		44	34.9	29.2	27.0	26.4	28.9		29.1
184K	189	172	173	150	130		814	10	7	8	6	6		37	18.9	24.6	21.6	25.0	21.7		22.0
250K	237	235	212	222	200		1106	10	10	7.5	8	6.5		42	23.7	23.5	28.3	27.8	30.8		26.3
171Q	140	123	114	119	135		631	8	6	4	5	5		28	17.5	20.5	28.5	23.8	27.0		22.5
44R	142	160	119	119	124	145	809	9	6	4	4	5	5	33	15.8	26.7	29.8	29.8	24.8	29.0	24.5
All Control Schools	1765	1832	1619	1564	1461	547	8784	81	71	59.5	56	51.5	19	338	21.8	25.8	27.2	27.9	28.4	28.8	26.0

TABLE 3

Number of Students, Number of Classes, and Average Class Size--Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten Levels--As of December 17, 1968

Eight ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1964

	Number of Students		Number of Classes		Average Class Size	
	Level		Level		Level	
School	Pre-K	K	Pre-K	K	Pre-K	K
83M	60	113	4	6	15.0	18.8
100M	59	140	4	7	14.8	20.0
154M	59	119	4	6	14.8	19.8
1X		193		8		24.1
120K	57	153	4	8	14.3	19.1
138K	28	219	2	11	14.0	19.9
40Q	60	193	4	11	15.0	17.5
18R	149	186	10	10	14.9	18.6
All Old MES	472	1316	32	67	14.8	19.6

Ten ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1965

	Number of Students		Number of Classes		Average Class Size	
	Level		Level		Level	
School	Pre-K	K	Pre-K	K	Pre-K	K
11M	60	139	4	6	15.0	23.2
146M	60	104	4	6	15.0	17.3
168M	49	101	4	6	12.3	16.8
110X	29	141	2	8	14.5	17.6
41K	54	110	4	6	13.5	18.3
80K	60	132	4	7	15.0	18.9
165K	63	119	4	6	15.8	19.8
307K	135	153	12	8	11.3	19.1
183Q	30	190	2	10	15.0	19.0
31R	58	137	4	8	14.5	17.1
All New MES	598	1326	44	71	13.6	18.7
All MES	1070	2642	76	138	14.1	19.1

Eight Control Schools

	Number of Students		Number of Classes		Average Class Size	
	Level		Level		Level	
School	Pre-K	K	Pre-K	K	Pre-K	K
144M	30	73	2	3	15.0	24.3
161M		160		8		20.0
29X		338		16		21.1
167K		285		12		23.8
184K		146		8		18.3
250K	28	191	2	8	14.0	23.9
171Q	120	221	8	10	15.0	22.1
44R	60	146	4	6	15.0	24.3
All Control Schools	238	1560	16	71	14.9	22.0

At just two ME schools did the average class size exceed 22--in one by 0.6, and the other by 1.1. Certain grades in some schools had average class sizes of more than 22, the highest being 24.5. The lowest class size was 14.1--in the first grade of a school where the average class size of all grades, one through six, was 16.8.

In several schools, evaluators found during their June visits that some of the class sizes had increased beyond 22, and others had decreased. (The data obtained from the Bureau of Educational Research records were based on enrollments of the previous December.) Practical reasons, such as new students being enrolled in the school and modifications in the teaching staff accounted for most of the changes.

At the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten levels, the differences between the average class sizes of the ME and control schools are less than 1.0 (Table 3). Only one ME school had an average pre-kindergarten class size of more than 15, and this one was 15.8. Kindergarten classes ranged from an average of 16.8 to 24.1 in the ME schools, although guidelines specified a class size of 20 for them, and from 18.3 to 24.3 in the control schools.

Expenditures for Instruction Proper

Per-capita pupil costs of instruction were computed by dividing the total expenditures as shown in Tables 4 and 5 by the pupil register. Obviously, all costs had risen greatly between the 1966-67 and 1968-69 school years. As a group, the ME schools' costs had not gone up in actual amount and percentage as much as those of the control schools, although the MES program still represented substantially larger expenditures per student.

In the ME schools per-capita costs had increased from $806 to $972, or 21%, over the two year period. The increase for control schools was from $416 to $599, or 44%, so that the MES costs, which had been nearly double those of the controls in 1966-67, were 62% higher in 1968-69. This is probably explainable in part by the fact that many improvements had been paid for by ME schools in earlier years, when they cost less.

Presumably, this is also a considerable part of the reason why the ME schools that were established in 1964 showed an increase in per-pupil cost of only $125 from 1966-67 to 1968-69, as compared to $209 for those established in 1965. However, the 1964 schools also had much higher registers. While the control schools had still higher registers, it is evident that

TABLE 4

Expenditures for Salaries, Supplies and Equipment for Instruction Proper, ME Schools, School Years 1966-67 and 1968-69

	1966-67					1968-69				
School	Salaries	Supplies & Equipment	Total Expenditures	Pupil Register	Per Pupil Costs	Salaries	Supplies & Equipment	Total Expenditures	Pupil Register	Per Pupil Costs
Eight ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1964										
83M	$ 770,316	$ 24,640	$ 794,956	999	$ 796	$ 950,274	$ 22,663	$ 972,937	1,008	$ 965
100M	809,413	23,523	832,936	1,055	790	1,024,230	22,698	1,046,928	1,083	967
154M	899,522	25,590	925,112	928	997	1,032,896	22,858	1,055,754	969	1,090
1X	748,704	25,368	774,072	1,021	758	985,442	24,303	1,009,745	1,229	822
120K	729,313	26,191	755,504	1,064	710	852,198	23,698	875,896	1,136	771
138K	966,911	30,766	997,677	1,390	718	1,189,687	36,174	1,225,861	1,391	881
40Q	898,778	28,400	927,178	1,046	886	1,080,752	23,372	1,104,124	1,089	1,014
18R	736,130	23,077	759,207	917	828	1,049,781	20,890	1,070,671	1,100	973
All Old MES	$6,559,087	$207,555	$6,766,642	8,420	$ 804	$8,165,260	$196,656	$8,361,916	9,005	$ 929
Ten ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1965										
11M	$ 685,668	$ 28,640	$ 714,308	685	$1,043	$ 791,837	$ 15,788	$ 807,625	718	$1,125
146M	753,290	29,481	782,771	913	857	957,029	22,168	979,197	965	1,015
168M	708,119	27,732	735,851	874	842	1,002,449	21,113	1,023,562	889	1,151
110X	661,707	31,695	693,402	1,084	640	886,037	23,144	909,181	989	919
41K	679,789	33,966	713,755	827	863	876,254	20,608	896,862	783	1,145
80K	341,650	16,902	358,552	517	694	493,660	12,368	506,028	531	953
165K	546,843	24,130	570,973	766	745	654,657	16,238	670,895	783	857
307K	623,091	25,737	648,828	722	899	938,717	22,662	961,379	852	1,128
183Q	689,168	27,609	716,777	878	816	926,981	20,688	947,669	1,007	941
31R	543,867	21,419	565,286	770	734	748,270	16,948	765,218	797	960
All New MES	$6,233,192	$267,311	$6,500,503	8,036	$ 809	$8,275,891	$191,725	$8,467,616	8,314	$1,018
Total MES	$12,792,279	$474,866	$13,267,145	16,456	$ 806	$16,441,151	$388,381	$16,820,532	17,319	$ 972

TABLE 5

Expenditures for Salaries, Supplies and Equipment for Instruction Proper, Control Schools, School Years 1966-67 and 1968-69

	1966-67					1968-69				
School	Salaries	Supplies & Equipment	Total Expenditures	Pupil Register	Per Pupil Costs	Salaries	Supplies & Equipment	Total Expenditures	Pupil Register	Per Pupil Costs
144M	$ 469,546	$ 14,102	$ 483,648	905	$ 534	$ 583,142	$ 13,227	$ 596,369	764	$ 781
161M	480,120	16,007	496,127	1,389	357	741,650	20,837	762,487	1,347	566
29X	878,975	29,124	908,099	2,535	358	1,410,361	38,133	1,448,494	2,735	530
167K	555,841	23,287	579,128	1,656	350	898,573	23,966	922,539	1,566	589
184K	534,512	19,696	554,208	1,292	429	651,059	18,535	669,594	960	697
250K	535,665	15,982	551,647	1,250	441	694,901	21,488	716,389	1,346	532
171Q	481,750	11,469	493,219	931	530	722,175	16,500	738,675	1,031	716
44R	490,966	16,350	507,316	1,049	484	594,132	12,612	606,744	1,043	582
All Control Schools	$4,427,375	$146,017	$4,573,392	11,007	$ 416	$6,295,993	$165,298	$6,461,291	10,792	$ 599

they fell below the ME schools in expenditures mainly because they had much smaller staffs, and therefore lower payroll costs.

Sizeable differences among the schools in the two classifications may be noted. Per-pupil costs in the ME schools ran from a high of $1,151 to a low of $771, but even among the 1964 schools the range was $1,090 to $771. Among the control schools, costs varied from $781 in one school to $530 at another. These wide expenditure ranges reflect the complexity of school situations and, probably, the different needs in various sections of the city.

Pupil Mobility and Attendance

According to Board of Education procedure, pupil mobility is computed by adding the number of children newly admitted to a school during a given period to the number leaving during the same period, then dividing the sum by the average register. Admissions to pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and the first grade are left out of account because they are the normal expectation for each year. Table 6 shows that many schools in both the ME and control groups had fairly high rates of pupil mobility, but that the rate had gone up less in ME schools than in control schools since 1965-66.

The high and low rates in the ME schools, 71.4 and 21.2, were not very different from the extremes in the control schools--77.7 and 25.0. The median increase for all ME schools was 1.7, while the median increase for the control schools was 12.4.

However, six ME schools succeeded in lessening the pupil mobility rate since 1965-66, one of them as much as -22.3 and one only -1.2. The highest increase in any ME school was 23.8. All the control schools experienced increases in pupil mobility, amounting to as much as 14.9 in one of them. The smallest increase in a control school was 1.8. During their June visits, the evaluators were told that all the ME schools had attempted to reduce pupil mobility and had made limited progress. Six out of eight control schools reported some progress.

During the course of their last round of visits in the spring, the evaluators reviewed the records at the ME schools to determine how long the fifth-grade pupils had been in these schools. Data were available for

TABLE 6

Average Register, Per Cent Attendance, Per Cent Pupil Mobility, ME and Control Schools, School Years 1965-66 and 1968-69

School	1965-66			1968-69		
	Average Register	Per Cent Attendance	Per Cent Mobility	Average Register	Per Cent Attendance	Per Cent Mobility
Eight ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1964						
83M	1,016	90.7	45.6	996	77.4	69.4
100M	1,008	89.3	40.6	1,054	81.9	39.4
154M	1,063	90.3	25.3	968	62.2	43.4
1X	1,033	88.2	48.5	1,209	69.5	52.9
120K	1,058	89.3	51.4	1,123	66.1	70.5
138K	1,304	90.0	36.0	1,380	73.3	55.9
40Q	1,090	90.0	28.9	1,086	73.3	37.8
18R	907	89.6	29.8	1,077	72.4	38.4
Median Old MES	1,045	89.8	38.3	1,081	72.8	48.1
Ten ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1965						
11M	760	90.1	59.9	703	78.2	52.6
146M	912	90.5	47.9	951	70.2	49.5
168M	835	86.3	49.1	894	68.6	50.1
110X	1,001	89.6	56.4	1,003	72.1	44.2
41K	907	87.1	56.3	772	70.3	71.4
80K	487	79.0	50.1	508	59.2	46.6
165K	731	89.1	47.1	737	68.8	50.7
307K	532	90.5	19.7	835	77.8	36.9
183Q	875	89.5	43.5	1,003	67.8	21.2
31R	635	90.7	43.5	798	69.5	40.5
Median New MES	797	89.5	48.5	816	69.8	48.0
Median All MES	909	89.6	46.3	982	70.2	48.0
Eight Control Schools						
144M	909		29.3	766	79.8	44.2
161M	1,305		33.3	1,325	78.6	41.8
29X	2,212		50.5	2,580	64.9	56.5
167K	1,602		42.0	1,553	67.5	56.7
184K	1,464		71.1	956	62.0	77.7
250K	1,175		54.0	1,330	67.1	55.8
171Q	766		23.0	1,013	68.3	27.3
44R	1,063		22.4	1,035	72.5	25.0
Median Control Schools	1,240		37.6	1,180	67.9	50.0

TABLE 7

Number of Years That 1968-69 Fifth-Grade Students Had Been in MES Program

Eight ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1964

Years in Program:	Number of Students					Per Cent of Students				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
School										
83M	15	12	7	31	44	13.7	11.0	6.4	28.4	40.3
100M*										
154M	9	8	4	9	64	9.5	8.5	4.2	9.5	68.0
1X	25	21	14	20	65	17.2	14.4	9.6	13.7	44.8
120K	19	24	18	27	66	12.3	15.5	11.6	17.5	42.8
138K*										
40Q	13	15	14	9	94	8.9	10.3	9.6	6.2	64.8
18R	12	15	5	1	76	11.0	13.7	4.5	0.9	69.7
All Old MES	93	95	62	97	409	12.3	12.5	8.2	12.8	54.1

Ten ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1965

Years in Program:	Number of Students					Per Cent of Students				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11M*										
146M	16	19	7	85		12.5	14.9	5.5	66.9	
168M*										
110X*										
41K	14	24	12	53		13.5	23.3	11.6	51.4	
80K**										
165K	18	17	12	31		23.0	21.7	15.3	39.7	
307K	6	8	4	59		7.7	10.3	5.1	76.6	
183Q	13	17	14	87		9.9	12.9	10.6	66.4	
31R	13	7	13	49		15.8	8.5	15.8	59.7	
All New MES	80	92	62	364		13.3	15.3	10.3	60.8	

* Records unavailable to evaluators when survey was made in June, 1969

** No fifth grade

six of the eight original ME schools, and for six of the ten schools that entered the program in 1965.

In the group of six original ME schools, 54.1% of the students had been in the MES program for five years (Table 7). The percentage ranged from a low of 40.3 in one school to a high of 69.7 in another.

In the other six ME schools only 60.8% of the pupils had been in the program for the full four years, with the percentages for the individual schools ranging from a low of 39.7 to a high of 76.6.

The study also showed that much of the mobility had taken place in the last two years. In three-fourths of the schools, approximately a fourth of their students had been in the MES program just two years or less. In one MES school, 23% of the pupils had been in the program only one year.

A special report from one of the ME schools revealed that, although the over-all pupil mobility rate had increased during the period, pupils who entered the pre-kindergarten classes were remaining in greater numbers in the primary grades. Whereas two years ago only 70% entered kindergarten, the projected figure for 1969-1970 was 98%.

Pupil attendance during the 1968-69 year was so greatly affected by the lengthy work stoppages that it was difficult to assess the holding power of the More Effective Schools as compared with their records in 1965-66. Attendance rates at the ME schools ranged from approximately 10% to 28% below the levels of the comparison period (Table 6).

Ethnic Background of Pupils

The pattern of ethnic composition of pupils did not change radically between 1966 and 1968 in either the ME or control schools (Table 8). In only seven schools did the Puerto Rican proportion change as much as 5%--increasing in three ME and three control schools, and decreasing in one ME school. Similarly, the Negro enrollment increased more than 5% in three ME schools, and decreased as much as 5% in one. The change in Negro enrollment did not exceed 5% in any control school. The percentage of "others" enrolled decreased by 5 points or more in four ME and four control schools, but rose that much in only one ME school. The percentage of "others" decreased, but by less than 5%, in ten additional ME schools, and in each of the remaining control schools.

TABLE 8

Percentages of Puerto Ricans, Negroes and Others in ME and Control Schools in December, 1968 as Compared With October, 1966

		No. of Pupils		Puerto Ricans		Negroes		Others	
School	Type	1966	1968	1966	1968	1966	1968	1966	1968
154M	ME	928	969	4.9	3.5	95.1	96.3	0.0	0.2
144M	Control	905	764	0.9	0.3	98.7	99.7	0.4	0.0
168M	ME	874	889	68.6	65.6	28.3	31.4	3.1	3.0
161M	Control	1389	1347	46.7	63.0	40.6	35.9	12.7	1.1
1X	ME	1021	1229	51.6	63.2	38.7	33.7	9.7	3.1
29X	Control	2535	2735	56.2	58.8	36.5	36.3	7.3	4.9
138K	ME	1390	1391	6.2	6.8	91.4	92.7	2.4	0.5
167K	Control	1656	1566	13.1	22.3	77.6	73.7	9.3	4.0
41K	ME	827	783	31.9	24.6	65.2	74.8	2.9	0.6
184K	Control	1292	960	31.1	33.8	67.9	65.5	1.0	0.7
120K	ME	1064	1136	79.9	85.6	16.2	13.0	3.9	1.4
250K	Control	1250	1346	72.9	74.4	15.9	17.9	11.2	7.7
183Q	ME	878	1007	14.9	12.4	47.5	44.9	37.6	42.7
171Q	Control	931	1031	16.3	21.8	41.8	45.1	41.9	33.1
18R	ME	917	1100	3.3	5.9	42.3	42.6	54.4	51.5
31R	ME	770	1043	7.4	11.8	50.2	51.6	42.4	36.6
44R	Control	1049	797	5.5	8.7	36.8	39.6	57.7	51.7
9 ME Schools		8619	9301	30.0	31.5	53.9	53.7	16.0	14.8
8 Control Schools		11007	10792	34.7	41.2	50.2	47.7	15.1	11.1
11M	ME	685	718	55.1	56.8	12.7	13.8	32.2	29.4
83M	ME	999	1008	74.4	70.9	20.5	24.2	5.1	4.9
100M	ME	1055	1083	2.1	0.0	97.9	100.0	0.0	0.0
146M	ME	913	965	53.5	50.7	37.7	41.6	8.8	7.7
110X	ME	1080	989	40.3	36.3	57.1	63.3	2.6	0.4
80K	ME	517	531	41.2	52.0	34.1	30.9	24.7	17.1
165K	ME	766	783	15.2	17.4	70.7	76.2	14.1	6.4
307K	ME	722	852	20.4	19.7	63.2	60.6	16.4	19.7
40Q	ME	1046	1089	2.9	1.4	94.9	98.1	2.2	0.6
All 18 ME Schools		16402	17319	31.5	31.7	55.5	56.6	13.0	11.7

TABLE 9

Ethnic Backgrounds of Pupils on ME and Control School Registers
(Percentages as of December, 1968)

ME Schools	No. of Pupils	Negro	Amer. Indian	Oriental	Puerto Rican	Spanish-Surnamed Americans	Other
11M	718	13.8	0.1	2.2	50.8	6.0	27.1
83M	1,008	24.2	0.0	1.9	68.8	2.1	3.0
100M	1,083	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
146M	965	41.6	0.0	1.6	49.8	0.9	0.1
154M	969	96.3	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.1	0.2
168M	889	31.4	0.0	1.0	65.0	0.6	2.0
1X	1,229	33.7	0.0	0.1	60.3	2.9	3.0
110X	989	63.3	0.0	0.0	34.7	1.6	0.4
41K	783	74.8	0.0	0.1	24.0	0.6	0.5
80K	531	30.9	0.0	0.0	51.8	0.2	17.1
120K	1,136	13.0	0.0	0.1	84.4	1.2	1.3
138K	1,391	92.7	0.0	0.1	5.1	1.7	0.4
165K	783	76.2	0.0	0.0	15.8	1.6	6.4
307K	852	60.6	0.0	0.1	19.2	0.5	19.6
40Q	1,089	98.1	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.6
183Q	1,007	44.9	0.0	0.0	12.3	0.1	42.7
18R	1,100	42.6	0.0	0.3	3.6	2.3	51.2
31R	797	51.6	0.0	0.2	9.3	2.5	36.4
Control Schools							
144M	764	99.7	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
161M	1,347	35.9	0.0	0.1	44.7	18.3	1.0
29X	2,735	36.3	0.0	0.0	56.9	1.9	4.9
167K	1,566	73.7	0.0	1.3	18.0	4.3	2.7
184K	960	65.5	0.0	0.1	33.7	0.1	0.6
250K	1,346	17.9	0.1	1.0	71.3	3.1	6.6
171Q	1,031	45.1	0.0	0.2	16.5	5.3	32.9
44R	1,043	39.6	0.1	0.3	7.0	1.7	51.3

More than 90% of the pupils in each of four ME schools were Negroes. One of these schools was paired with the single control school that had a similar enrollment composition. Only one of the other ME schools that had more than 90% Negro students was paired with a control school, and the student population of that control school was 73.7% Negro. The highest percentage of Puerto Rican pupils, 85.6, was in an ME school in Brooklyn, which was paired with a Brooklyn control school that was 74.4% Puerto Rican.

As a group, the control schools showed very much the same proportions of Negro, Puerto Rican, and "other" students as the ME schools with which they were paired.

Table 9 shows that American Indians and Orientals did not constitute a significant proportion of the "other" category in any of the schools. Only in one Manhattan school did Orientals comprise as much as 2.2% of the student population; Indians accounted for 0.1% in one ME school and two control schools. However, the Spanish-surnamed students who were not Puerto Ricans but were formerly counted as such in the school statistics made up a sizeable proportion in two schools--18.3% in one control school, and 6% in an ME school.

Pupils With English Language Difficulties

These statistics probably reflect not only the differences among the schools in the proportion of pupils who have problems in connection with speaking or understanding English, but also differences among the standards used by the schools in rating these difficulties for record purposes. For example, one Manhattan ME school is recorded as having no pupils with language difficulties, while another lists 83.2% who do. Such great variations may be due in part to differing interpretations of the categories listed on the school-census data sheet for describing the extent of the language difficulty. (Table 10).

The overwhelming majority of pupils reported to have language problems were from Spanish-speaking homes. However, in all except two schools, some of the children with language difficulties were classified as having English-speaking backgrounds, and in one ME school such children made up 35.7% of the student body. The largest percentage of children from other language backgrounds who had trouble with English was in a control school, where they comprised 4% of the pupils.

No substantial differences between the groups of ME and control schools in the extent of the language problem was apparent. The control-school range was smaller, however, with none of them listing as many as half their children as having language difficulties.

TABLE 10

Percentages of Pupils With English-Language Difficulties in ME and Control Schools (As of December, 1968)

ME Schools	No. of Pupils	Language Background of Students With English-Language Difficulties: English	Spanish	Other	No English-Language Difficulties
11M	718	5.6	33.1	1.8	59.5
83M	1,008	7.8	27.1	0.9	64.2
100M	1,083	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
146M	965	35.7	44.7	2.8	16.8
154M	969	16.2	0.8	0.2	82.8
168M	889	8.3	43.3	1.0	47.4
1X	1,229	4.2	30.0	0.3	65.5
110X	989	4.2	11.2	0.0	84.6
41K	783	2.8	13.5	0.1	83.6
80K	531	6.4	25.8	0.0	67.8
120K	1,136	0.0	47.4	0.1	52.5
138K	1,391	1.2	2.8	1.8	94.2
165K	783	7.7	5.6	0.3	86.4
307K	852	2.9	4.4	0.0	92.7
40Q	1,089	0.4	0.0	0.0	99.6
183Q	1,007	1.0	1.1	0.0	97.9
18R	1,100	0.1	0.8	0.2	98.9
31R	797	1.5	4.4	0.3	93.8
Control Schools					
144M	764	7.2	0.0	0.0	92.8
161M	1,347	3.6	30.7	0.3	65.4
29X	2,735	3.2	23.6	0.0	73.2
167K	1,566	3.0	6.2	1.1	89.7
184K	960	4.8	15.0	0.1	80.1
250K	1,346	9.5	36.4	0.3	53.8
171Q	1,031	5.9	13.2	4.0	76.9
44R	1,043	0.0	0.7	0.0	99.3

Staff Positions

Principals

Each of the ME and control schools was under the direction of a single principal or assistant principal serving in that capacity (Table 11).

Assistant Principals

Although one of the eight control schools had five members of its staff serving as assistant principals, and four had three serving in that capacity, the allotment of staff for that position was greater for the ME schools.

Of the eighteen ME schools, five had five members serving as assistant principals, nine had four, and three had three. Only one school had two members of the staff serving in that capacity. All except two ME schools had a ratio of better than 1 assistant principal for every 260 pupils, as compared with an average of 1 assistant principal for every 425 pupils in the control schools. The number of pupils per assistant principal reached 520 in three control schools, and 670 in another.

Administrative Assistants

According to the data obtained, each of the ME schools had an administrative assistant. No control school reported having such a position.

Secretarial Staff

Secretarial help, too, was abundant in the ME schools. The approximate ratio of secretaries to pupils in these schools ranged from 1:320 to 1:672. The majority of these schools were within the range of one secretary to 350-550 pupils.

Teaching Staff

In the majority of the ME schools, pupil enrollment averaged between 12 and 14 pupils per teacher. Three ME schools averaged fewer than 11 pupils per teacher. Control schools, on the other hand, averaged about 20 pupils per teacher. Four control schools had more than 20 pupils per teacher, two had between 17 and 19, and two had between 15 and 16.

Although the proportion of teacher specialists assigned to control schools seemed to be high, it was not as great as that in the ME schools. The cluster teachers and specialists in ME schools account for the large difference between the pupil-teacher ratios of the ME and control schools. This difference however, had narrowed by 2.2 pupils per teacher between 1966-67 and 1968-69. While the pupil-teacher ratio in both groups of schools had improved during that time, the control schools had reduced the

TABLE 11

Staff Positions in the More Effective Schools and Control Schools During the Spring Term of 1968-69

	More Effective Schools																		Control Schools							
School:	11M	83M	100M	146M	154M	168M	1X	110X	41K	80K	120K	138K	165K	307K	40Q	183Q	18R	31R	144M	161M	29X	167K	184K	250K	171Q	44R
Pupil Register:	718	1008	1083	965	969	889	1229	989	783	531	1136	1391	783	852	1089	1007	1100	797	764	1347	2735	1566	960	1346	1031	1043
Staff Positions																										
Administrative																										
Principal	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ass't. Principal	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	2	4	5	3	4	5	4	4	3	2	3	5	3	3	2	2	3
Admin. Ass't.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1								
Clerical																										
School Secretary	3		3 2/5	4	3	4	4	4	4	2	4	5	3	3	5	4	4	3	2	3	9	4	3 2/5	3	3 3/5	3
Teachers																										
Regular Class	27	39	42	35	33	38	59	38	31	16	40	49	26	27	40	39	30	25	24	49	82	47	37	40	26	35
Kindergarten	12	8	14	7	8	8	8	8	6	8	8	12	6	16	14	10	10	7	3	4	8	6	4	4	5	3
Pre-Kindergarten	4	6	6	4	8	4		3	4	6	4	2	4	20	5	3	10	6	2					1	4	2
Over-Quota	1	4		1					2		2	1	2	4	2		1	4			4		3	1	5	4
Teacher-Specialists																										
Cluster	20	16	16	15	12	16	7	13	16	5	15	21	11	9	14	13	15	11		8	22	5		6	10	
CRMD, TMR, EMR	1	2		1							2										7			2		
Art	1						1	1	1			1					1	1	4/5				2	1		
Music	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2/5		1	1	1		1
Industrial Arts						1								1			1									
Health Ed. (Phys. Ed.)		1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	2		1
Health Conservation				3	2			3																		
Science				1		1	1				1	1			1	1			1				1	1		1
Home Economics		1										3/5					1									
Library	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	2	1		1
Speech Improvement	1	1	1 1/2		2/5	1 1/5			1		1	1	2/5	1	1 1/5	1/5	2	2	2/5	2/5			1	2/5	1	1 2/5
Language Arts								1											1							4
Eng. Lang. Res.				1			1			1	1															
Reading Improvement		1	1		2				2	1		3	1			1			2/5				2/5			
Corrective Reading	1	1	1	1		1		1			1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Jr. Guidance	3	3	2	4	8	2	3	3	4		3	3	2	3	3	2	2	4			3					1
Bilingual		1		1		1	1	1			1			1						1	2		1 2/5	1		
Non-English																				1				1		
ESL																					1	1	1		1	
OTP	1		1		5		1		2		1	1		1			10	4	12	7	3	13		2 1/5	15	1
Apprentice Teachers									10	5							11			11						
Clinical-Guidance Personnel																										
Psychiatrist		1	1			1			1		1		1/5	1	1		1	1								
Psychologist	1	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	4/5	1	1	1	1	1							1	
Social Worker	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	2	4/5		1	1	1	1							1	1
Guidance Counselor	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	2	1	1 3/5	3	2	3	2	2	2 2/5
Other Professional **Supportive Personnel**																										
Attendance Teacher			1					1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1					1				1	
Teacher Trainer		1			2	1						1								2	1	1	1	1/2		
Health Counselor		1		1	1				1				1			1										
Comm. Relations Coord.	2	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1			1		1			
Audio-Visual Spec.		1		1	1	1		1			1		1	1			1	1								

ratio by 2.9, and the ME schools--which have had favorable ratios since the start of the program--had reduced theirs by 0.7 (Table 1).

Clinical Guidance Personnel

Although 10 ME schools had the services of a psychiatrist, no control school had such a position on its staff. All but two ME schools had the services of a psychologist, but only one control school had this type of service.

Two control schools had the services of social workers, while all but three of the ME schools had social workers assigned as regular staff members.

The number of guidance counselors in ME schools permitted ratios ranging from about 230 to 540 pupils per counselor. Four schools had fewer than 250 pupils per counselor. Only three schools had more than 400 pupils for each counselor position. Among the control schools, only one had fewer than 350 pupils per counselor, while three schools had between 750 and 850, and one school had more than 900 pupils per counselor.

Supportive Personnel

Supportive personnel in control schools was limited, as compared to that in the ME schools. Control schools reported no personnel in the position of health counselor or audio-visual specialist.

Half of the ME schools had attendance teachers assigned, while only two, or one-fourth, of the control schools reported having this position.

One of the most critical positions is that of teacher trainer. Only four of the eighteen ME schools reported having that position on their staffs, as compared with five of the control schools.

Teacher Experience

The experimental and control schools revealed a fair degree of correlation in the teaching experience of their staffs. The ME schools had a slightly higher percentage of regular teachers, 71% as against 65% in the control schools. Among the ME schools, a median of 43% of the regular and substitute teachers had just one to three years of experience, as compared with a median of 53% among the control schools (Table 12).

Far greater variations in the teaching experience of the staffs was found among the schools within each group. For example, 92% of the regular teachers in one ME school had more than five years experience, while two other schools had only 23% and 29% in that category. Only 2% of the teachers in the first school had just one to three years experience, as against 52% and 38% in the other two. Eighty per cent of the regulars in

TABLE 12

Percentage Distribution of Teachers' Years of Experience, ME and Control Schools, as of December, 1968

	Number of Teachers			Regulars Yrs. Experience			Substitutes Yrs. Experience			Total Yrs. Experience		
School	Reg.	Sub.	Total	1-3	4-5	6+	1-3	4-5	6+	1-3	4-5	6+
Eight ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1964												
83M	77	11	88	19	29	52	64	9	27	25	26	49
100M	61	37	98	21	28	51	89	8	3	47	20	33
154M	60	36	96	10	23	67	75	19	6	34	22	44
1X	57	42	99	30	12	58	71	19	10	47	16	37
120K	68	19	87	32	27	41	79	0	21	43	20	37
138K	90	25	115	37	22	41	76	12	12	45	20	35
40Q	71	21	92	17	17	66	71	15	14	29	17	54
18R	68	30	98	26	18	56	77	16	7	42	17	41
Median Old MES	68	28	97	23	23	54	76	14	11	43	20	39
Ten ME Schools Established in the Fall of 1965												
11M	53	40	93	2	6	92	60	25	15	27	14	59
146M	59	25	84	5	22	73	48	32	20	18	25	57
168M	49	35	84	18	11	71	80	11	9	44	11	45
110X	66	23	89	38	33	29	87	9	4	51	27	22
41K	59	15	74	29	39	32	87	0	13	41	31	28
80K	40	6	46	52	25	23	83	17	0	57	23	20
165K	50	15	65	34	24	42	87	6	7	46	20	34
307K	61	33	94	30	32	38	94	6	0	52	24	24
183Q	65	13	78	14	26	60	62	30	8	22	27	51
31R	53	17	70	30	23	47	76	24	0	41	23	36
Median New MES	57	20	81	30	25	45	82	14	8	43	24	35
Median All MES	61	24	89	28	24	52	77	14	9	43	21	37
Eight Control Schools												
144M	30	18	48	13	7	80	78	11	11	37	9	54
161M	49	31	80	55	14	31	81	13	6	65	14	21
29X	73	79	152	34	13	53	86	9	5	61	11	28
167K	51	31	82	51	18	31	90	10	0	66	14	20
184K	43	20	63	33	23	44	70	15	15	44	21	35
250K	53	23	76	47	10	43	87	9	4	59	9	32
171Q	56	12	68	39	6	55	83	17	0	47	7	46
44R	50	7	57	20	14	66	71	0	29	26	13	61
Median Control Schools	51	22	72	37	14	49	82	11	6	53	12	34

one control school had more than five years experience; in two other schools the percentage was 31.

Substitute teachers in the ME schools generally were a little more experienced than those in the control schools. Within the ME group, the median percentage who had 4-5 years of experience was 14, as compared to 11 in the group of control schools. The median percentages with at least 6 years of experience were 9 for the ME schools and 6 for the control schools.

Ethnic Composition of School Staffs

The ethnic composition of the pedagogical personnel of the ME schools (Table 13) was predominantly white, with nine of the eighteen schools having at least 90% white staff members, and an additional six having more than 80% in this category. Two ME schools had staffs that were 30% Negro. Four others had more than 15% of their staffs composed of Negroes. Although each school had some Negro staff members, only eight had Puerto Ricans on their staffs. No school had as many as 5% in this category. Only one school reported having a Spanish-surnamed American on its staff.

Control schools seemed to have approximately the same ethnic composition as the ME schools. Four of the eight control schools had over 90% white staff members. Only one control school had fewer than 70% white pedagogical personnel.

One school had 31% Negro staff members, one had about 20%, and one had about 12%. Four of the control schools had small percentages of Puerto Rican professional staff members, and three had staff members with Spanish surnames who were not Puerto Rican.

The non-teaching personnel in the ME schools seemed to reflect the ethnic composition of their neighborhoods, as might be expected. In only four schools did whites number 50% or more--64% in one. Negroes constituted a majority in eight schools--100% in two, 76% to 88% in three, 65% in one, and 50% to 53% in two. Puerto Ricans made up 50% of these staff members in one school, more than 25% in seven others, 5% to 18% in five, and none in five.

On the forms used by the Board of Education to collect staff data from the schools, non-teaching personnel was defined as including the following: school aide, auxiliary trainer, educational assistant, family assistant, family worker, parent program assistant, and teacher aide.

The non-teaching personnel of the control schools were of much the same ethnic pattern as prevailed in ME schools, and also reflected generally the ethnic composition of the neighborhoods. At one school, 71% of

TABLE 13

Ethnic Composition of Staffs of ME and Control Schools as of March, 1969
(Table entries are percentages)

	Pedagogical Personnel				Non-Teaching Personnel			
ME Schools	White	Negro	Puerto Rican	Spanish-Surnamed Americans	White	Negro	Puerto Rican	Spanish-Surnamed Americans
11M	96.4	2.4	1.2	0.0	52.6	15.8	26.3	5.3
83M	80.2	17.7	2.1	0.0	27.6	41.4	31.0	0.0
100M	68.3	30.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
146M	83.2	16.8	0.0	0.0	4.2	45.8	50.0	0.0
154M*					0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
168M	87.1	8.6	4.3	0.0	33.3	38.1	28.6	0.0
1X	90.0	9.0	1.0	0.0	32.1	50.0	17.9	0.0
110X	91.5	8.5	0.0	0.0	5.3	52.6	42.1	0.0
41K	91.9	8.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	76.2	9.5	0.0
80K	95.8	2.1	2.1	0.0	42.9	19.0	38.1	0.0
120K	82.0	17.0	1.0	0.0	34.8	21.7	43.5	0.0
138K	82.0	18.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	83.3	5.6	0.0
165K	95.7	4.3	0.0	0.0	47.4	47.4	5.2	0.0
307K	85.5	13.5	0.0	1.0	5.9	64.7	29.4	0.0
40Q	70.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	88.0	0.0	0.0
183Q	92.4	7.6	0.0	0.0	64.0	36.0	0.0	0.0
18R**	97.1	1.9	1.0	0.0	53.6	39.3	0.0	0.0
31R	97.4	2.6	0.0	0.0	63.1	31.6	5.3	0.0
Control Schools								
144M	69.1	30.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
161M***	75.9	20.5	2.4	1.2	9.7	48.4	38.7	0.0
29X	88.9	8.5	2.6	0.0	10.7	62.5	26.8	0.0
167K	87.2	12.8	0.0	0.0	22.7	68.2	9.1	0.0
184K	92.8	5.8	1.4	0.0	26.9	53.9	19.2	0.0
250K	94.2	3.2	1.3	1.3	25.9	22.2	51.9	0.0
171Q	96.1	2.6	0.0	1.3	31.8	52.3	13.6	2.3
44R	95.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	70.6	17.6	11.8	0.0

---

* Record data incomplete for Pedagogical Personnel

** Also 7.1% of Non-Teaching Personnel in "Other" category

*** Also 3.2% of Non-Teaching Personnel in Oriental category these staff members were white, and it was the only one at which whites numbered as many as one-third. Negroes constituted a majority in five schools--100% in one, 52% to 68% in four. Puerto Ricans were a majority (52%) in one school, more than 25% in two, and 9% to 19% in four.

Two ME and three control schools had small percentages of their non-teaching staffs who were not Puerto Ricans, but had Spanish surnames, or were of other ethnic groups, such as Orientals.

Teacher Mobility

To express the rate of teacher mobility, the total number of teachers replacing those who had left was divided by the total number of budgeted teaching positions. This figure was then translated into a percentage. All teacher replacements were included, regardless of the reason for leaving (such as maternity, sabbatical, transfer, or promotion). There is a greater possibility for mobility due to maternity leaves in the ME schools because of the increased number of pre-kindergarten and kindergarten classes, which necessitate staffing by women. The mobility data are presented in Table 14 for both the ME and control schools.

The data indicate that teacher mobility for ME schools was 7.3%, as compared with 6.6% for the control schools. One of the ME schools, which was unable to implement the program guidelines fully because of overcrowding, had a mobility rate of 23.6% of the staff. This undoubtedly added to the differential between the two groups of schools. When considered as a whole, the mobility rate, regardless of the reason for leaving, was low in both categories of schools, and could not be considered a serious problem in either the MES or control schools.

TABLE 14

Per Cent of Teacher Mobility in ME and Control Schools, School Years 1965-66 and 1968-69

	1965-66		1968-69	
	MES	Control	MES	Control
Total number of budgeted teaching positions	1,487	420	1,422	561
Total number of teachers leaving October to June	123	33	116	37
Total number of teachers replacing those leaving	92	27	104	37
Per cent mobility	6.2	6.4	7.3	6.6

Outside-Funded Programs, Other Than MES, in the Schools

The principals of both ME and control schools were asked what programs other than MES (instructional, remedial, recreational, or the like) their schools operated with funds received from any other source than their regular budgets. The 26 principals reported 35 such programs, but only four of them were carried on in more than two schools. The four, in the order of most frequent occurrence, were Head Start, Vacation Day Camp, Summer Elementary School, and After-School Study Program. Each of these four programs was reported in about the same proportion among the ME as among the control schools.

CHAPTER 10

READING AND ARITHMETIC ACHIEVEMENT AS MEASURED BY STANDARDIZED TESTS

Objective measurements of the reading and arithmetic achievement progress of the fifth-grade pupils in the ME and control schools were obtained from the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. The progress of the pupils was evaluated over a two-year span--from the third grade in 1967 to the fifth grade in 1969. The third-grade reading and arithmetic test scores and the fifth-grade reading test scores were provided by the Bureau of Educational Research from the city-wide testing program files. Arithmetic test results for the fifth-grade pupils this spring were procured through the special testing that was arranged by the evaluators. All these reading and arithmetic tests were scored outside of the school system under the auspices of the publisher of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.).

A basic consideration in choosing the Metropolitan Achievement Tests for this evaluation purpose was the fact that these had been administered on a city-wide basis two years ago and thus provided a baseline for progress appraisal. In addition, the evaluators considered the Metropolitan Tests to be high in technical qualities and appropriate in content for New York City school children.

The fifth-grade group was selected for this analysis because it was the highest grade that would give a cross-section of all the MES schools (only some of them had sixth-grade classes), and because achievement in a grade at or near the top of the MES range was deemed likely to yield the best indication of the program's cumulative effects.

Testing Conditions in the Classrooms. The amount of confidence that can be placed in test results depends in part upon the conditions of test administration, including the pupils' motivation and attitudes during the testing session. To appraise these conditions, 12 members of the evaluation team made observational visits to a sample of the schools while the Metropolitan Achievement Tests were being administered during four days in March, 1969.

TABLE 15

Distribution of Observers' Ratings of Classroom Teachers' Administration of Standardized Tests in MES and Control Schools' Third-Grade and Fifth-Grade Classes--March, 1969

	MES (14 classes in 10 schools)				Control Schools (7 classes in 4 schools)			
Materials:	Yes	No			Yes	No		
Readily available	12	2			5	2		
Administrator:								
Adherence to directions	14	0			7	0		
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Manner	10	2	2	0	5	2	0	0
Clarity of speech	10	4	0	0	4	3	0	0
Supervision	9	5	0	0	4	2	1	0
Students:	Very	Moderate	Slight	None	Very	Moderate	Slight	None
Familiarity with the test	0	7	2	5	0	3	0	4
	Anxious	Eager	Attentive	Casual	Anxious	Eager	Attentive	Casual
Motivation	1	8	4	1	1	3	2	1
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Deportment	7	3	3	1	1	5	1	0
Attitude	6	5	2	1	2	4	1	0
Understanding of directions	5	8	1	0	2	5	0	0
Compliance with directions	6	7	1	0	2	5	0	0
Self-reliance	7	5	2	0	1	4	2	0
Room Conditions:								
Space	8	4	2	0	3	4	0	0
Heat	8	4	2	0	3	4	0	0
Light	11	3	0	0	2	4	1	0
Ventilation	9	3	2	0	4	3	0	0
Overall Rating N:	3	9	2	0	1	6	0	0
%:	22%	64%	14%	0	14%	86%	0	0

The sample consisted of 14 classrooms in 10 ME schools and 7 classrooms in 4 control schools.

Conditions rated by the observers included the availability of necessary testing materials, manner and clarity of speech of the classroom teacher who was conducting the testing session, the behavior and apparent attitudes of the students, and room conditions (space, heat, light and ventilation). The ratings are summarized in Table 15.

As may be seen from the last row of the table, the modal overall rating of the testing sessions in both the MES and control classrooms was "good." The ME classes received more overall ratings in the "excellent" column, but 14% were rated as low as "fair", while none of the control classes were rated that low. None of the classrooms observed were rated as low as "poor" on the "overall" scale, although a rating that low was given for student deportment and attitude in two MES classes. In no class did the students seem to be unduly familiar with the contents of the test.

In the evaluators' judgment, based on these observations of a sample of classroom testing sessions in March, 1969, the tests were given under conditions that were sufficiently standardized and uniform to justify placing a reasonable amount of confidence in the results. While similar observational ratings are not available for the 1967 testing sessions, the evaluators are not aware of any evidence or indications that would tend to make the test results of that year challengeable.

Analysis of Results. To insure comparability of the third and fifth-grade results, the basic analysis was limited to the scores of the students who had taken the reading and arithmetic tests in the spring of both the third grade (1967) and the fifth grade (1969). The class lists were searched visually for the names of the students who met this criterion. Allowance was made for slight, reasonable variations of name forms or spelling from one of the class lists to another. Although some of the scores seemed to the evaluators to be extraordinarily high or low, none of them were excluded from the tabluations.

After the eight scores for each student had been entered on a single list, the scores were key-punched and verified. Data processing equipment was then used to prepare distributions of the grade equivalent scores and to compute statistics such as means, standard deviations, standard errors of means and differences, and t-ratios.

The mean scores of the MES and control groups, as well as the differences between the means of the groups in the paired schools, are shown in Tables 16 and 17. The schools are designated by arbitrary code letters.

Additional test data going back to the fall of the second grade in 1965, tabulated by the Bureau of Educational Research as part of its continuing longitudinal study of the MES program, were made available to the evaluators by that Bureau. A brief discussion of those data, as well as a presentation of the findings of a junior high school follow-up study, are included in this chapter.

Interpretation of the Test Results

Careful consideration should be given to the following points in interpreting the test results:

1. Some of the means seem to be unrealistically high, such as those of the third-grade groups in ME schools A and G in both Word Knowledge and Reading, and those of the fifth-grade groups of ME school F and control school CC in Word Knowledge. These means surpass the grade norms (3.7 for the third grade and 5.7 for the fifth grade) by 11 to 18 months on the grade equivalent scale. Whether these unusually high means resulted from exceptionally effective instruction or some other factor is not clear to the evaluators.

2. The third-grade reading and arithmetic tests, and the fifth-grade reading tests, were administered on scheduled dates in March as part of the city-wide testing program. The fifth-grade arithmetic tests, which were introduced this spring at the request of the evaluators, were administered during the month of March by most of the ME and control schools, but seven gave them in April. These seven included a pair of ME and control schools (A and AA), three other control schools (DD, EE, and GG), and two ME schools (K and M) that were not paired with control schools. The schools that administered the arithmetic tests in April had approximately a one-month advantage over those who gave these tests in March.

3. As will be discussed in a later chapter of this report, some of the paired ME and control schools may not be as well matched now as they were in 1965, when the control schools were selected.

4. Individual pupils within the ME and control-school pairs were not matched for the purpose of this analysis of test results because such a procedure would have resulted in a major reduction in the sizes of the groups.

5. Since ME school L does not have classes beyond the second-grade level, no test results are shown for it.

6. The full impact of the MES program is probably not reflected by these test results because they cover only a two-year span. In view of the relatively high pupil mobility rates in both the ME and control schools, it seems likely that a substantial number of the pupils comprising the tested groups had not started their schooling in those same schools. Furthermore, the children who were in the fifth grade in 1969 could not have had the benefit of pre-kindergarten or kindergarten training in ME schools, since they were at the first-grade age when the MES program was started.

These considerations are cited in some detail because test results all too often are viewed as "hard data," needing little or no interpretation. The evaluators urge that the following statistics be interpreted with due regard for the qualifications cited above, and against the background of the full range of information given throughout this report.

Reading and Arithmetic Data Analysis--Grade Range 3-5

Word Knowledge and Reading. The eight ME schools that were compared with control schools, taken as a group, had third-grade Word Knowledge and Reading means that were significantly higher than those of the control schools. At that grade level, the 467 pupils in the ME schools had average scores that surpassed the national norm (3.7) by three school months in Word Knowledge and by two months in Reading. As is well known, it is unusual for schools in disadvantaged inner-city areas to reach the national norm in academic achievement. The test group of 532 third-grade pupils in the eight control schools fell below the national norm by two months in both Word Knowledge and Reading.

At the fifth-grade level, the differences between the means of the groups of paired MES and control schools in Word Knowledge and Reading were not large enough to be statistically significant. The means of both groups fell below the national norm for this grade level (5.7) by three to eight months. Among the individual schools in the eight pairs, however, the fifth-grade norm was surpassed by two ME schools and one control school in Word Knowledge, and by one ME school and one control school in Reading.

The total group of 949 pupils tested in the 17 ME schools had third-grade means that were above the national norm by two months in Word Knowledge and by one month in Reading. In the fifth grade, this total ME group fell seven months below the national norm in Reading, but it reached the norm in Word Knowledge. Of the 17 schools, the numbers reaching or surpassing the grade norms are as follows: third-grade Word Knowledge, 7; third-grade Reading, 8; fifth-grade Word Knowledge, 8; and fifth-grade Reading, 1.

Arithmetic. On both the Arithmetic Computation and the Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts subtests, the group of eight ME schools was significantly ahead of the control-school group at the third-grade level, although the differences between the means were small (one to two months). In the fifth grade, the MES and control groups, comprised of the paired schools, had equal means in Problem Solving and Concepts, but the control-school group showed a lead of one month in Arithmetic Computation. Only one of the paired schools reached the fifth-grade norm of 5.7 in Problem Solving and Concepts, and that was a control school. Four control schools, but only two of the eight paired ME schools, reached or exceeded the fifth-grade norm in Arithmetic Computation.

For the total of 949 pupils in the 17 ME schools, the third-grade means of 3.4 in Arithmetic Computation and 3.5 in Problem Solving and Concepts were just three months and two months, respectively, below the national norms. The fifth-grade means of this same group--5.3 in Arithmetic Computation and 5.1 in Problem Solving and Concepts--came within four to six months of the national norms for that grade level. Six of the 17 ME schools had means at least as high as the national norm in third-grade Arithmetic Computation, five in third-grade Problem Solving and Concepts, five in fifth-grade Arithmetic Computation, and one in fifth-grade Problem Solving and Concepts.

As explained previously, this analysis is based on the test results of pupils whose records showed scores for both the third and fifth grades.

TABLE 16

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test for ME and Control School Students Tested in Both the Third and Fifth Grades (Spring, 1967 and Spring, 1969)

School	Type	No. of Pupils	Word Knowledge		Reading	
			Gr. 3	Gr. 5	Gr. 3	Gr. 5
A	ME	70	5.4	5.9	5.1	4.8
AA	Control	106	3.3	4.6	3.4	4.5
	Difference		2.1**	1.3**	1.7**	0.3
B	ME	59	3.6	5.5	3.6	5.3
BB	Control	66	4.0	5.4	3.7	5.1
	Difference		-0.4*	0.1	-0.1	0.2
C	ME	38	3.1	5.0	3.1	4.4
CC	Control	32	3.2	7.0	3.3	4.8
	Difference		-0.1	-2.0**	-0.2	-0.4
D	ME	78	3.4	4.7	3.3	4.3
DD	Control	77	3.6	5.2	3.6	5.1
	Difference		-0.2	-0.5	-0.3	-0.8**
E	ME	68	3.3	4.8	3.4	4.8
EE	Control	60	3.3	5.4	3.4	5.0
	Difference		0.0	-0.6*	0.0	-0.2
F	ME	44	3.5	8.4	3.6	6.1
FF	Control	43	3.3	4.8	3.4	4.7
	Difference		0.2	3.6**	0.2	1.4**
G	ME	53	5.3	4.6	4.7	4.4
GG	Control	72	3.3	5.1	3.4	5.0
	Difference		2.0**	-0.5	1.3**	-0.6*
H	Me	57	4.0	5.4	3.9	5.2
HH	Control	76	3.7	5.6	3.8	6.1
	Difference		0.3	-0.2	0.1	-0.9*
8 ME Schools		467	4.0	5.4	3.9	4.9
8 Control Schools		532	3.5	5.2	3.5	5.0
Difference			0.5**	0.2	0.4**	-0.1
I	ME	38	3.9	5.5	3.9	5.2
J	ME	34	5.7	5.7	4.9	5.4
K	ME	79	3.5	7.2	4.0	5.2
M	ME	44	4.3	6.0	4.2	4.8
N	ME	79	3.9	5.8	3.7	5.4
O	ME	58	3.4	5.7	3.4	5.1
P	ME	69	3.5	5.6	3.5	5.2
Q	ME	30	3.4	5.7	3.5	5.2
R	ME	51	3.4	4.6	3.5	4.6
All 17 ME Schools		949	3.9	5.7	3.8	5.0

---

* Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

TABLE 17

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on the Metropolitan Arithmetic Test for ME and Control School Students Tested in Both the Third and Fifth Grades (Spring, 1967 and Spring, 1969)

			Arithmetic Computation		Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts	
School	Type	No. of Pupils	Gr. 3	Gr. 5	Gr. 3	Gr. 5
A	ME	70	3.9	5.2	3.6	4.8
AA	Control	106	3.2	5.0	3.3	4.6
	Difference		0.7**	0.2	0.3**	0.2
B	ME	59	3.0	5.5	3.2	5.2
BB	Control	66	3.4	5.7	3.6	5.6
	Difference		-0.4**	-0.2	-0.4**	-0.4*
C	ME	38	2.8	5.0	3.3	4.9
CC	Control	32	3.1	5.8	3.1	5.7
	Difference		-0.3	-0.8**	0.2	-0.8**
D	ME	78	3.0	5.1	3.0	4.8
DD	Control	77	3.4	6.0	3.3	5.3
	Difference		-0.4**	-0.9**	-0.3**	-0.5*
E	ME	68	3.3	5.6	3.4	5.4
EE	Control	60	3.3	5.4	3.3	4.9
	Difference		0.0	0.2	0.1	0.5**
F	ME	44	4.0	5.7	4.3	5.4
FF	Control	43	2.8	5.0	3.1	4.9
	Difference		1.2**	0.7**	1.2**	0.5**
G	ME	53	3.8	5.2	4.3	4.9
GG	Control	72	3.3	5.8	3.4	5.2
	Difference		0.5**	-0.6**	0.9**	-0.3
H	ME	57	3.8	5.7	4.1	5.6
HH	Control	76	3.5	5.4	3.7	5.4
	Difference		0.3	0.3	0.4**	0.2
8 ME Schools		467	3.4	5.4	3.6	5.1
8 Control Schools		532	3.3	5.5	3.4	5.1
Difference			0.1**	-0.1*	0.2**	0.0
I	ME	38	3.4	5.7	3.4	5.7
J	ME	34	3.7	5.7	4.0	5.5
K	ME	79	3.3	5.0	3.3	4.8
M	ME	44	3.0	5.2	3.0	4.7
N	ME	79	3.5	5.9	3.4	5.6
O	ME	58	2.6	4.9	2.9	4.9
P	ME	69	3.1	5.4	3.3	5.3
Q	ME	30	3.4	5.3	3.9	5.2
R	ME	51	3.7	4.9	3.6	4.5
All 17 ME schools		949	3.4	5.3	3.5	5.1

---

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

To check for a possible sampling bias introduced by this criterion, the means of the total third-grade and fifth-grade groups in the schools were reviewed. In most of the ME schools, the total-grade means did not differ from those reported above by more than two months. The relationships between the means of the paired ME and control schools for the total-grade groups were not appreciably different from those cited above.

B.E.R. Reading Data Analysis--Grade Range 2-5

From its continuing study of the MES Program, as mentioned earlier in this report, the Bureau of Educational Research provided data on the Word Knowledge and Reading mean scores of the children who were in the fifth grade during the 1968-69 school year and who had been tested in the fall of the second grade, as well as in the third and fifth grades, in the paired ME and control schools. This gave information on the reading achievement progress of the students from grade two to grade five, and permitted the evaluators to make a more comprehensive analysis of the trends in the reading test scores in the ME and control schools. The B.E.R. data for the second grade covered more than 70% of the fifth-grade students in the paired schools whose scores were the subject of the earlier section of this chapter. The Bureau plans to report the findings in more detail later. Unfortunately, arithmetic tests had not been administered to the same groups of children when they were in the second grade.

TABLE 18

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on the Metropolitan Reading Tests for ME and Control School Students Tested in the Second Grade (Fall, 1965), Third Grade (Spring, 1967), and Fifth Grade (Spring, 1969)

		Word Knowledge			Reading		
	No. of Pupils	Fall, Grade 2	Spring, Grade 3	Spring, Grade 5	Fall, Grade 2	Spring, Grade 3	Spring, Grade 5
8 ME Schools	330	1.9	4.2	5.8	1.9	4.0	5.1
8 Control Schools	404	1.8	3.5	5.2	1.9	3.5	5.0
Difference		0.1	0.7	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.1

In the fall of the second grade, the mean scores of the 330 MES and 404 control-school pupils were at almost the same level, the only difference being in Word Knowledge. Here, the MES average was one month ahead of that of the control schools. By the spring of the third grade, the MES means had risen

2.3 years in Word Knowledge and 2.1 years in Reading. The gains in the control schools between the second and third grades were 1.7 years and 1.6 years, respectively, on the same subtests. Two years later, in the spring of the fifth grade, the mean scores of the MES students had advanced an additional 1.6 years in Word Knowledge and 1.1 years in Reading. Gains in the control schools during the same period were 1.7 years in Word Knowledge and 1.5 years in Reading (Table 18).

Thus, the MES group as third graders had taken a lead over the control pupils that amounted to seven months in mean score in Word Knowledge and five months in Reading. This lead was maintained at six months for Word Knowledge in the fifth grade, but was reduced to one month for Reading at that grade level.

Neither the ME nor control-school pupils had mean scores that reached the national norm (2.1) in the second grade. The averages for the ME schools, however, were above the national norms for Word Knowledge at both the third and fifth-grade levels, and for Reading in the third grade. The control schools did not attain the level of the national norms at either the third or the fifth grade on either subtest.

Junior High School Reading Follow-Up Data for Two Pairs of Schools

An additional appraisal of student progress in reading was made through a follow-up study of students who had been in paired ME and control schools as fifth-graders two years ago and were in junior high schools as seventh graders during the 1968-69 school year. Just two pairs of schools were used for this study, because these were the only pairs where the ME and control school served as feeders for a junior high school in common. For the other pairs, a comparison of the seventh-grade scores of the ME and control students would have been complicated by the effects of differences between the junior high schools.

The results for the two pairs of schools were pooled, and the combined data are shown in Table 19. As may be seen from the table, the group of 43 pupils in the two ME schools had Word Knowledge and Reading means of 4.8 on the grade equivalent scale in the fifth grade. These means were significantly higher than those of the 83 pupils in the two control schools by 9 school months. At the seventh-grade level, the group of ME students had

Word Knowledge and Reading means that were five months above those of the control group, but these differences were not statistically significant. Evidently the change to the junior high school caused the MES students to lose ground.

TABLE 19

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test for ME and Control School Students Tested in the Fifth Grade (Spring, 1967) and Also in the Seventh Grade in Junior High School (Spring, 1969)

Schools	No. of Pupils	Word Knowledge Gr. 5	Word Knowledge Gr. 7	Reading Gr. 5	Reading Gr. 7
ME schools A and F	43	4.8	6.0	4.8	5.7
Control schools AA and FF	83	3.9	5.5	3.9	5.2
		0.9**	0.5	0.9**	0.5

** Significant at .01 level

This interpretation is borne out to some extent by a comparison of the mean scores of MES and control-school children in these same groups who were matched, as closely as possible, on the basis of fifth-grade scores on the two subtests. This matching was possible for 18 pairs of students in one junior high school, and for 8 pairs in the other. The mean scores of both the MES and control pupils in the first group were 4.0 in Word Knowledge and 3.9 in Reading in the fifth grade. In the seventh grade, the MES means on these two subtests were 5.2 and 5.1, and the control-school means were 5.6 and 5.2. For the second group, the fifth-grade MES means were 4.4 for both subtests, and the control-school means were 5.4 in Word Knowledge and 4.3 in Reading. In the seventh grade, the MES means for this small group of eight pupils were 5.2 in Word Knowledge and 4.9 in Reading, and the control-school means were 6.2 in Word Knowledge and 5.9 in Reading.

The assistant principal of another ME school made available to the evaluators some junior high school follow-up data that he had tabulated. These consisted of the Metropolitan Reading Test scores of 65 pupils who had gone from the sixth grade in his school to two different junior high schools. The reading means for this group were 5.9 in the sixth grade, and 6.4 in the seventh, representing a gain of five months over the one-year period. This ME school did not have a paired control school.

Summary of Achievement Test Findings

The test results that were surveyed in this chapter indicate that pupils in the ME schools have made strong progress in reading and arithmetic skill development in the early grades (up to grade 3), but they tend to lose some of their lead over the control schools by the time they reach the fifth grade. The limited amount of data that were reviewed in the sixth grade and seventh grade follow-up studies showed that the progress of the ME students is further slowed down when they leave the ME schools and go on to junior high schools.

In both the ME schools and control schools, pupil groups at the fifth-grade level compared more favorably with the national norms in Word Knowledge and Arithmetic Computation than in Reading and Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts. This finding suggests that the pupils have been more successful in acquiring vocabulary and in learning fundamental arithmetic skills than in learning to reason, draw inferences, and solve problems. If other evidence bears out this finding, more attention should be given to helping the pupils develop thinking and reasoning skills.

Since the MES Program has been in operation for just five years in some schools, and for only four years in others, a comprehensive longitudinal study covering the entire range of pre-kindergarten to grades five or six cannot yet be made. Consequently, the full impact of the program on pupils exposed to it for that grade range will not be appraisable until several more years have elapsed. Inferences about the effectiveness of the program based on the test data currently available should be regarded as tentative.

CHAPTER 11

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FINDINGS

The five questionnaires described in Chapter 3 were mailed to the principal of each school for distribution. Teachers gave out those for their classes, and students were instructed to take the parent's forms home and bring them back to the teacher. The returns from all five groups were funneled through the schools for the most part, although a small proportion of teachers mailed theirs directly to The Psychological Corporation. All received by the end of July are included in the results described here. A few came in too late to be tabulated.

One ME school is not represented because it reported that the forms never had arrived. One control school explained its failure to send back any questionnaires by saying the staff had no time for this assignment. Student and parent questionnaires, distributed to the fifth grade only, went to only 17 ME schools because the 18th had no fifth grade.

The percentage of returns from the various groups varied considerably. The totals were:

	Approximate Total Numbers		Respondents	
	MES	Controls	MES	Controls
Teachers	1462	338	720	294
Professional Supportive	134	41	78	29
Paraprofessionals	462	227	221	119
Parents	2087	1326	736	337
Students	2087	1326	1341	794

Teachers' Questionnaire Responses

A questionnaire of 33 items, two of them open-ended, was completed by 1,014 teachers—720 from 17 ME schools, and 294 from 7 control schools. Women outnumbered men four-to-one, with a slightly larger proportion of men in the control schools—23%, as against 18% in the ME schools.

In educational background, the two groups were fairly equal, with a few more of the MES teachers having master's degrees—36%, as compared to 25% among the control-school teachers. Some differences between the amounts of teaching experience of the two groups were found. Among the nine gradations that were listed in the questionnaire--from one year of teaching to nine years or more--the biggest differences were in the two-year and nine-years-or-more categories. The former included 13% of the MES and 22% of the control-school teachers; the latter, 26% of the MES and 19% of the control-school teachers. Control schools had a slightly larger proportion of one-year teachers--19%, as against 17% for MES. No appreciable difference between the two groups was noted in the length of time teachers had been teaching in the same school. For about a quarter of each group, it was one year; for three-quarters it was five years or less.

A large majority of the respondents (72% of the MES and 69% of the control-school teachers) reported that they had not received in-service training during the year. Most of those who did have such training said it had been helpful, but "fairly helpful" was checked twice as often as "very helpful." Only 24% of the MES teachers and 17% of control-school teachers said they had helped to train others.

Several questions asked for the teachers' opinions of the quality of their schools and the instruction offered--in broad, general terms. On all of these questions, a substantial majority checked answers that indicated a favorable opinion. On only one was a large difference in the responses of the two groups as a whole noted. Nearly half (47%) of the control-school teachers said their classes were too large, while only 11% of MES teachers reported this condition. The next largest spread came on a question about "the overall quality of instruction in your school," 67% of the MES teachers saying it was "excellent" or "above average," while 54% of control-school teachers gave these ratings.

The curriculum was described as generally appropriate for the students by 71% of the MES and 67% of the control-school teachers. Seventy-one percent of the MES and 72% of the control-school teachers indicated that they got the right amount of help in the classroom. A teacher's liking for his school was indicated in answer to a question asking whether or not he would encourage a friend to work in it next year. Of the MES teachers, 73% said "yes," as did 74% of the control teachers. Even larger percentages, 83%

of the MES group and 90% of the controls, indicated that they planned to return to the same school next year. At one control school, the faculty's replies to this question was unanimously affirmative. An ME school returned the largest percentage of "no" answers--27%--to this item.

On these items, the responses from individual schools varied greatly. "The overall quality of instruction," for example, was rated excellent or above-average by 87% of one ME school's teachers and by 29% of another's, while in control schools the range was 79% to 17%. In this last school, no teacher gave the rating of "excellent." The curriculum was said to be appropriate by 44% of the teachers in one ME school, and by 81% in another. On the same question, the control-school range was 44% to 67%.

In answers to a set of 14 questions, teachers reported on their problems with students, school facilities, and relations with individuals and groups in and out of their schools. The answer choices were: "no problem," "slight problem," "serious problem," and "not applicable or don't know." The "no problem" blank was marked by as few as 5% of the control teachers on one item and as many as 85% on another. The MES teachers' range was 6% to 82%. In both groups, the area that was least free of problems, as indicated by the lowest percentages of "no problem" responses, was student behavior. The distributions of the teachers' responses to this item were as follows:

	MES	Control
No problem	6%	5%
Slight problem	44	41
Serious problem	48	54
Not applicable or don't know	2	0

On eight of the other items, the control-school teachers indicated more problems than the MES teachers did. The area cited by most teachers, after student behavior, was student motivation. This was rated as either a slight or serious problem by 80% of MES and 86% of control teachers. Next came student ability, checked by 72% of MES and 78% of control-school teachers.

The greatest differences between the two groups in this part of the questionnaire were on the items about obtaining audiovisual materials and equipment, and size of classrooms. The first was a problem to 43% of the control-school teachers, but to only 18% of the MES teachers. The second, classroom size, was indicated as a problem by 49% of the teachers in the control schools, as compared with 16% of those in the ME schools. Classroom facilities reportedly posed problems for 50% of control and 38% of MES teachers.

The item on which the MES respondents reported their relatively highest incidence of problems, as compared to control-school replies, was "relations with staff members"--24% for MES as against 13% for the controls. This and "getting assistance from teacher aides" were the areas where control-school teachers reported the fewest problems. In this part of the questionnaire, the teachers in the paired ME and control schools were in general agreement.

Four teaching techniques were effectively used in the ME schools more often than in the control schools, according to the questionnaire responses. The percentages of teachers who indicated frequent and effective use of these techniques were:

	MES	Control
Cluster teaching	68%	53%
Team teaching	27	14
Small-group instruction	71	52
Individualized instruction	49	30

These differences were reversed in some of the school pairs however. On cluster teaching, for example, 37% of one ME school's teachers said they used it often and effectively, while 62% in the paired control school said they had done so.

Most respondents reported excellent or good relations between teachers and others--including colleagues, administrators, students, parents, counselors, and outside referral agencies--although a minority had indicated problems in this area. The distributions of opinions expressed by the MES and control-school teachers were within 7 percentage points of each other for all these relationships. The percentages for some individual schools were well above or below the group averages, though. For example, in one ME school, the percentages of teachers reporting good relations with staff, students, and parents fell 22 to 35 points below the MES averages.

The MES and control-school teachers were in close agreement about the usefulness of personnel assigned to help them. Those listed were teacher specialists, teacher aides, guidance counselors, social workers, psychologists, doctors and nurses, and dental personnel. "Very useful" was the verdict of 45% of MES and 46% of control-school respondents on the teacher specialists; 47% and 45%, respectively, on teacher aides; 24% and 13% on social workers; 22% and 16% on psychologists; 42% and 36% on guidance counselors; 43% and 41% on doctors and nurses; and 34% and 43% on dental personnel. The lower percentages on the social worker and psychologist responses may be explained partly by the fact that about one-third of the control-school teachers said they had no help from these specialists. In one of these schools, 86% of the teachers either checked "not available" or did not answer the question at all. For these two specialists, the highest percentage reporting "very useful" was 37, recorded from two ME schools.

The last seven multiple-choice questions drew opinions about the trends in the teacher's school in the areas of student learning and development, parental interest, and community relations. On every point except parental interest, the percentage indicating substantial improvement (or maintaining excellence) was higher in ME than in control schools, although the margin was slight in some instances. This rating was given to parental interest by 21% of the control-school teachers, compared to 19% of the others. Less than one percentage point separated the two groups on community relations, with just under 18% of the control teachers and just over 18% of the MES teachers reporting improvement. But 9% in ME schools and 19% in control schools thought that these relationships were growing worse.

The biggest difference between the groups on this part of the questionnaire was recorded on the question about students' rate of lerning in reading and other language skills. "Substantial improvement" was the answer of 43% of the teachers in the ME schools and of 25% in control schools. These were the highest percentages reporting improvement in this part. Students' general academic development was rated as sustantially improved by 33% of the MES teachers and 16% of the control-school teachers. Slight improvement on most of these points was indicated by ore control than MES teachers, so that if responses in both "slight" and "substantial" improvement are added, the differences are very little. The item on which the greatest number of teachers indicated the trend was downward was "students' attitude toward school." Here, 18% of the control-school respondents and 15% of the others checked "getting a little worse."

In general, the teachers of matched ME and control schools recorded similar replies to this part of the questionnaire. The most notable exception was one control school that did not have a single teacher who indicated substantial improvement in reading, academic development in general, attitudes toward school, or students' social-emotional development and self-image. On all these items, the teachers in the matched ME schools returned replies that were similar to the average of all the ME schools.

The range of opinion within each group was considerable. On reading, for example, 69% of one ME school's teachers and 20% of another's reported substantial improvement. On substantial improvement in academic development, the ME schools ranged from 52% to 22%, while the control schools ranged from 33% to 0.

Most of the teachers in both groups offered recommendations for improving their schools. Stricter discipline was urged by 49 MES teachers, the largest number making any one suggestion, and 61 made other disciplinary proposals. Some 80 recommendations were recorded--from providing a marching band to improving the physical plant and teaching methods. Control-school teachers offered 48 suggestions, of which one urging smaller classes drew the most support (65 teachers). Extended guidance services were proposed by 27 control teachers, and each of the 46 other recommendations were made by from 1 to 14 control teachers.

Additional comments on their schools were made by a minority of teachers--only 14 in the control schools and 131 in the others. Comments on MES were generally favorable, with 28 expressing praise, while only two were critical. Various suggestions for improving the program were offered, and a substantial number of teachers expressed objections to some features of the questionnaire itself.

Students' Questionnaire Responses

A questionnaire of 44 items--42 of them multiple choice--was filled in by 2,135 fifth-grade students. Of these, 1,341 were in 16 ME schools and 794 in 7 control schools. Failure to reply to specific questions was not a significant factor influencing the results, since virtually all the questions were answered by 98% or more of the students. The question with the highest percentage of blanks, 4.5, asked whether students got enough help in speaking.

On practically all the questions, the differences among the ME schools and among the control schools were greater than the differences between the two groups. For example, 42% of the MES and 48% of the control-school students said they liked school much more this year than last. Among the ME schools, the range on this question was 32% to 70%; among the control schools, it was 25% to 62%.

The ME school highest on this item also had the highest percentages of students responding positively to the following items: receiving extra help from teachers when needed, receiving help in arithmetic, believing that this school is better than others, liking the teaching methods, getting along well with teachers, and feeling happy about personal accomplishments in the school. This school was also close to the top on the other questions. Similarly, the control school returning the 62% score on "liking school much more" was highest on four other items, close to the highest on most of the others, but third from the bottom in the percentage of students who believed their school was better than others. These two schools were not paired with each other.

When the children who reported liking school a little more this year are added to those who said they liked it much more, the percentages are 56 for MES and 63 for control-school students. Similarly, when asked later in the questionnaire whether "you like school more now than you used to," 66% of MES and 73% of control-school students checked "yes."

In rating the help they got at school, the worth of their school, and their feelings about various aspects of school life and work, the two groups of students were in general agreement, judging by the percentages of affirmative, negative, and neutral answers.

The two groups as a whole were virtually indistinguishable in their reports on how often a teacher gave them extra help when they needed it. Less than one percentage point separated them on all answer choices--"very often" (checked by most, 43%), "sometimes," "only once in a while," and "never." Yet the percentages among individual schools ranged widely. For example, the percentage of "very often" responses ranged from 23% for one ME school to 61% for another, and from 34% to 40% among the control schools.

On 16 questions calling for a "yes," "no," or "not sure" answer, the biggest spread between the two groups of students occurred when they were asked if they got enough help in social studies. "Yes" was checked by 70% of the MES respondents, and by 57% of the control students. Most of the other items in this part were answered with not more than 5 percentage points separating the two groups, and several of the percentages were identical. Seventy-eight percent of each group said that they were getting enough help with reading, 68% with writing, and 60% with science. On arithmetic, 78% of MES and 74% of control-school students checked "yes." Yet, again, the range among individual schools was considerable. On help in reading, for example, affirmative answers were recorded by 65% of the students in one ME school, and by 81% in another. The corresponding range for control-school students was 69% to 89%.

The MES students labeled their homework a waste of time more frequently than did the control-school students--18% as compared to 13%. In two ME schools, this percentage rose to 30, as against 10 and 13 in their control schools. The lowest for any ME school was 9%, and for a control school, 6%. These two were paired schools. The highest for a control school was 18%, as compared with 14% for its paired ME school.

The widest range of the students' responses among schools was registered on the question, "Do you think your school is better than other schools?" While "yes" answers were given by 46% of MES and 39% of control-school children as a whole, 82% of the students in one ME school and only 14% in another rated theirs as better. The range in control schools was 77% to 17%. The highs and lows were not from matched schools.

On eight of twelve items which asked students to describe themselves, the children in control schools gave themselves more favorable ratings than did MES pupils. The four questions which drew higher ratings from the MES respondents were concerned with joining in activities in and out of school, and asking and answering questions in the classroom. The largest difference between the two groups was on "I do my work even when I don't like to do it." Seventy-seven percent of the control-school students said they did, as against 66% of the MES children. The smallest difference was on the replies to "I spend my extra time wisely." This was the only item in this part of the questionnaire on which both groups rated themselves below 50% in the "very well" column--45% for MES students and 44% for the others. (The alternative answers were "not at all" and "only a little.")

Ten questions asked if students were happy, unhappy, or had no feeling about aspects of school, home, neighborhood, and themselves. The control-school children checked "happy" a little more often than the others did on all except three of these items--"the way you get along with parents," "how well you read," and "how well you do in school." The largest difference among these three was in the last, 71% for MES students as against 67% for the controls. The greatest spread between the two groups, where more control than MES students checked "happy," (76% to 69%), was on the item "the way you get along with your classmates."

Of the students who returned questionnaires--1,341 from MES and 794 from control schools--75% in each group offered comments on extra attention they were getting to make them better students. In both groups, the items most frequently mentioned by far were extra attention in their reading and mathematics studies, with reading slightly in the lead. Among the MES students, social studies, spelling and science were next most frequently mentioned, with extra after-school help or homework a poor fifth. Control-school students mentioned extra attention in science, attention from parents, and library use in that order. MES students mentioned 39 other areas, and control-school students 40, not all of them having to do with extra help.

Seventy percent of the MES students and 62% of control-school students took the opportunity offered by the questionnaire to make additional comments. Favorable and unfavorable remarks were offered in equal numbers by both groups of students, but many more individuals made favorable remarks. For example, 96 MES students said they liked their teachers and classmates, and 88 said the school was "nice and clean." Similarly, 145 control-school students reported that the school was good, and 121 said the same about the teachers. The largest number subscribing to negative comments in ME schools (37) was that the lunch was bad. The negative comments made by the largest number of control-school students (18 each) were that the teachers were mean, and there were too many fights. More than a score of other remarks from each group ranged for MES students from "school should teach more" to "too many things to learn" and "too many mice and rat holes" (18) to praise for new bathrooms (5).

Parents' Questionnaire Responses

A questionnaire of 32 items was distributed to the parents of all fifth-grade children in both the experimental and control schools with a request that the completed forms be returned to the teachers. A total of 1,073 filled-in questionnaires was received--736 from 16 ME schools and 337 from 7 control schools. (One ME school was not included because it had no fifth grade, and one never received the questionnaires mailed to it. The staff of one control school reported that it did not have time to administer the questionnaires.)

Comparison of the results show far greater differences between schools within each group--among ME schools or among control schools--than between the groups as a whole. On many questions where ME school parents varied in their responses 4 or 5 percentage points from control-school parents, the variation within each group of schools reached a range of 50 points or more.

Although the responses indicated little difference between the two groups in frequency of visits to the schools or attendance at PTA meetings, control-school parents generally replied "don't know" more often than MES parents did to questions asking for views on how the schools were administered, the adequacy of facilities and staff, and the nature of services provided for students. The two groups of parents used the "don't know" response with about equal frequency on items directed at the actual results of school work or their children's improvement in learning and interests. On these last points, the responses of the parents in the two groups were generally in agreement.

On 11 of the 12 questions in this part of the questionnaire, at least 75% of the parents of both groups said that their children had improved during the year. On the twelfth, "planning a career," improvement was indicated by 68% of the MES parents and by 73% of the others. On eight of these items, the percentage of control-school parents who said their children had improved was a little higher than that of MES parents, the reverse being true for the other four. The difference, however, was 3 percentage points or less on all the questions except "talking about school work," where 81% of MES parents and 88% of control parents reported improvement, and on "planning a career," which was mentioned above.

On specific school subjects, the percentages of answers signifying improvement, listing the MES parents first, were: reading, 83% and 84%; arithmetic, 83% and 81%; vocabulary, 77% and 74%; speaking, 76% and 79%.

Most parents reported that their children had been in the same school for four years or more. But 54% or more of the control-school children had been in their school five years or more, as against only 36% of the MES students. The range in control schools in the five-years-or-more bracket was 73% to 35%, and in the ME schools 63% to 9%. However, some of the ME schools were too new for any children to have been enrolled for more than four years. Fairly equal mobility between the two groups is suggested by the fact that 28% of the MES and 27% of the control-school pupils had been in their school two years or less.

Asked to compare their children's school with others in the neighborhood, 53% of MES parents checked "better," as against 47% of the control-school parents. Most of the rest in both groups marked "about the same" or "don't know" in almost equal numbers, while only 3% of MES parents and 1% of the others checked "worse."

Little difference between the two groups was recorded on questions about services offered to the children. Help with personal problems was reported by more MES parents (52% as against 41%), but "extra help with school work" was checked by more control-school parents (69% to 64%). The two groups were almost equal in saying that the schools encouraged them to take part in school activities--77% of MES and 76% of control-school parents. More MES parents (31%) than control-school parents (21%) had been visited by someone from the school.

Generally speaking, parents of children in the individual control schools responded in much the same way as parents in the ME schools with which they were matched. Where differences between two schools on any one item was more than 10% in reporting on children's improvement, for instance, it was usually (but not always) a control-school's parents who checked "yes" more consistently. On reading, this was the case in one pair of schools, 92% to 77%, and in another 97% to 80%. On vocabulary, 100% of the parents in one control school reported improvement, as compared to 78% in the paired ME school. On the other hand, in another pair, 93%

of the ME parents said their children had improved in arithmetic, as against 80% in the control school.

Three of the seven matched groups differed no more than 10% on any item. The pair of schools with the most spreads of more than 10% scored that big a difference on only four of the twelve items about children's improvement.

The largest spread between the percentages for individual schools was on improvement in vocabulary. The parents of students in one control school said "yes" 100% , as against only 59% in another control school. The largest difference between ME schools was in arithmetic , with 95% of parents in one and 77% of parents in another reporting improvement.

A little less than half the parents offered suggestions "to make this school better"--333 from MES and 149 from control schools. Among these were parents who expressed themselves as well satisfied with the school as it is--12% of MES parents responding and 21% of the controls. More in the MES program and fewer in the control schools wanted discipline improved--22% of the MES responses and 14% of the controls. Scattered suggestions came from both groups for smaller classes, more parent involvement in the schools, improved plant and custodial services, changes in curriculum, after-school activities, more understanding teachers, administrative changes, and home visits by teachers. The nature and variety of the proposals were roughly equivalent in the two groups.

Additional comments were offered by 171 MES and 52 control-school parents--a somewhat higher MES proportion--23% as against 15%. Favorable remarks were made by 37% of these MES respondents and 61% of control-school respondents. Both groups had suggestions, often duplicating those summarized in the previous paragraph, for improving discipline and other school features. General dislike of the school was evidenced in such comments as "tear down the school" and "I refuse to send my child to this school" from MES parents, and "no use" and "keep my children out of this school" from control-school parents.

Questionnaire Responses of Professional Supportive Staff Members

A 26-item questionnaire was returned by 107 professional workers who were not teachers--78 from ME and 29 from control schools. About two-thirds of each group were women. The 107 individuals gave their specialties as follows: ME schools--supervisor, 8; guidance counselor, 35; psychologist, 14; psychiatrist, 1; social worker, 11; special teacher, 2; other, 7. Control schools--guidance counselor, 9; special teacher, 16; other, 4.

The MES group included 6 who had a bachelor's degree; 66, a master's; 3, a doctorate; and 3 "other." In the control group, 13 held the bachelor's degree, and 16 a master's. Nearly half of the MES group failed to indicate their current professional status, but 35 said they had New York City licenses, as did 22 of the control group. A large majority of the respondents had practiced their specialties in the same school for four years or less.

Professionals in the control schools reported a much heavier caseload than did their colleagues in MES. None of the former saw fewer than 11 students a week, and 52% saw more than 40 a week, they said. Twelve per cent of MES professionals checked the brackets of "10 a week or less"; 35% checked "over 40." Returns from ME schools showed 73% reporting their working space as adequate, as against 52% from control schools. Equipment was rated adequate by 86% of the MES group and 69% of the controls.

On two items suggesting an opinion of the school served--whether the professionals planned to return next year and whether they would recommend the school to a friend--those in ME schools were more affirmative. On both items, 85% checked "yes," while 66% of the control group so marked their forms. However, both groups replied overwhelmingly, and in about the same proportions, that they found relations with staff, students, parents, and community excellent or good, as shown below.

	Per Cent Checking "Excellent" or "Good"	
Relations With	MES	Control
Other staff members	86%	73%
Students	84	87
Parents	91	93
Community members	77	76

Similarly, 75% of the MES group and 83% of the controls said students' attitude toward the school was excellent or good. Eighty-one per cent of MES and 69% of control-school professionals reported that parents were more interested in their children's needs as a result of the school's influence.

Responses from the ME schools to six of seven questions asking about the trend of school changes in student learning and development, parental interest, and community relations were more optimistic than those from control schools. On the seventh, parental interest and involvement in school affairs, 35% of the control-school respondents checked "improving substantially," as against 26% of the MES professionals.

The biggest difference in this part of the questionnaire was on the item asking about the students' rate of learning in reading and other language skills. Substantial improvement was the verdict of 39% of the MES returns, but of only 10% of the controls. This was also the highest percentage giving this opinion on any of the seven items in the set, although the percentages on general academic development and students' attitudes toward school were close--35% and 37%, respectively. In one ME school, all four of its professionals checked "substantial improvement" for every one of the seven items except community relations. On this last point, two reported only slight improvement, and one expressed no opinion.

Recommendations for school improvement ranged over a wide field, with a large majority of the professionals replying to this item. Each specialist expressed a desire for improved communications with students and school personnel, for greater attention to Spanish-speaking children, and for more services. Counselors especially emphasized the need for more individual instruction, but pleas for this or small-group teaching came from others also. Tighter discipline was mentioned as desirable, but not to the extent that it was requested by teachers and paraprofessionals.

Since about 50 suggestions or comments were made by the MES professionals, and nearly half as many by controls, with each being mentioned by only one or two individuals, it is difficult to summarize them except to say that they displayed very wide interests and concerns, and seemed to reflect varied experiences.

Paraprofessionals' Questionnaire Responses

More questionnaires were returned from the control school paraprofessionals, in proportion to their numbers (an average of 17 per school), than from the ME schools, which averaged 13. The total was 340, including 221 from ME schools and 119 from control schools. More than 80% of the respondents in both groups were either teacher aides or assistants. Eight per cent in MES and 3% in control schools were family workers, while family assistants made up 7% of the MES group, against 3% of the others. A few (less than 4%), did not classify themselves.

The educational level of both groups was very much the same. More than two-thirds had gone through high school, and more than one-fifth had taken college courses. The MES aides reported somewhat longer experience in the schools they served. Seventeen percent had worked in the same school for at least four years, and 27% for five years or more. The comparable figures for the control schools were 10% and 19%.

The paraprofessionals of both groups expressed liking for the same characteristics of their schools, and in roughly the same proportions. Five of the six characteristics or features--administrative, teaching, guidance personnel, relations with parents and community, and facilities--were labeled "good" by 62% to 77% of those in MES and by 66% to 85% of those in control schools. The sixth feature, "specialists," was called "good" by 49% in MES and 35% in the control schools. In four ME and two control schools, the aides unanimously agreed "teachers" were a good feature in their school. Similar unanimity was shown in three ME schools and one control school on relations with parents and the community.

On a list of 25 duties that paraprofessionals perform, the one most frequently checked in MES was "assist with lunches and snacks," marked by 74%; least frequently checked by these aides was "prepare list of agencies that might be helpful to parents and the school" (13%). At the head of the list for control school aides was "go with children on trips" (71%), and at the bottom (10%) was "accompanying parents and children on visits to outside agencies for special help." Paraprofessionals in the control schools reported helping more in teaching and discipline than did the others. Percentages of those who said they performed these duties were:

	MES	Control
Help with disciplinary problems	58%	65%
Help with reading problems	41	61
Help to teach children	25	51
Interpreting a foreign language in class	18	27

On this last point, the make-up of the student body seemed to be an important factor. In five ME schools and one control school, the aides indicated that they never served as interpreters. But in one ME school, 71% said they did, as did 57% in one control school.

Control-school aides also reported more work and talk with parents than did their counterparts in MES. Those in MES checked in greater proportions items that indicated they helped with outdoor play, with clean-up, with personal needs of children, in accompanying the children to and from school and to outside agencies, and in registering pre-kindergarten children. Nearly 90% of both groups said the school was making good use of their abilities. Their expressed opinion of the children they served follows. Percentages of "no responses" have been omitted.

	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Very Poor	
	ME	Control	ME	Control	ME	Control	ME	Control	ME	Control
Getting along with classmates	11	13	44	49	21	17	3	-	0.9	0.8
Getting along with the teacher	16	2	43	40	15	4	-	-	-	-
Showing interest in school work	10	15	39	41	21	21	4	-	0.5	-
Showing interest in learning	11	16	41	36	21	26	2	-	-	-
Following directions	9	8	37	34	23	32	9	2	2	-
Joining in class activities	15	19	40	44	17	11	0.5	3	-	-
Joining in class discussions	9	8	39	42	19	22	3	2	0.5	-
Being self-confident	4	2	41	39	25	32	4	4	-	-
Behaving in school	3	2	36	35	21	32	12	6	3	-

	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Very Poor	
	ME	Control	ME	Control	ME	Control	ME	Control	ME	Control
Keeping neat and clean	11	17	43	36	21	23	3	-	-	-
Taking responsibility	5	7	39	36	24	29	6	2	-	2
Taking pride in themselves	11	8	40	42	20	22	4	2	-	0.8
Being proud of their school	18	21	33	32	18	18	5	4	2	0.8

On three open-ended questions, some of the paraprofessionals recommended changes in their schools, criticized a wide variety of school practices or procedures, and commented upon their work and the MES program. Members of both groups said they wished to do more teaching and to work more with parents and the community or in the school offices. Many suggested a need for better relations between teachers and parents, and proposed what they said would be specific improvements. Their recommendations more frequently concerned matters of student behavior and staff training or experience than of physical equipment.

CHAPTER 12

DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS' VIEWS OF THE PROGRAM

Personal interviews were conducted with all but one of the district superintendents involved. Most of them favored continuance of the More Effective Schools Program, with limited expansion. A minority, however, expressed the feeling that other needs have higher priorities than this plan. All were somewhat in agreement in attributing certain very positive factors, as well as some negative ones, to this program.

Among the positive comments were statements by two district superintendents that a pattern of steady growth in reading ability had evolved during the period of the program's operation in their schools.

The superintendents unanimously indicated that school atmosphere had definitely improved as a result of the MES program, that pupil interest had shown considerable growth, and that the attitudes of pupils toward school had become much more positive.

They agreed that teacher morale was unquestionably higher. They said that smaller classes and increased pupil services reduced the frustrations usual in schools in disadvantaged areas. Consequently, they said most teachers had advanced in positive professional attitude.

Closely allied to these points, superintendents suggested, was evolution of better human relations in ME schools, with teachers, pupils, and parents working together in a much more desirable atmosphere. Increased involvement of parents in the ME schools was also reported. While parent organizations and special meetings were not necessarily well attended, the superintendents said, the quality of participation worked definitely toward understanding of the curriculum and assistance in implementing the program.

The superintendents placed considerable stress on the ever-growing betterment of school-community relations, resulting in strong support for the program. Despite possible criticism of the increased cost of MES, it was indicated that the communities in general have been very receptive to the plan. Most of the superintendents said they did not think MES would suffer from decentralization.

They expressed disappointment in the failure of objective tests to produce more definite indications of pupil growth in reading and mathematics. They suggested that the great emphasis on these skills, as well as the extensive time and effort applied to them, should have achieved better results.

Superintendents explained that, despite the increase in staff and pupil services, many teachers had not individualized instruction to a significant extent. Several superintendents reported that the additional teacher in the classroom had not been used effectively. They said that methods applicable to large groups were still being used by some teachers in handling smaller groups, so that the MES advantages were not effectively employed to meet individual pupil needs. Most of the superintendents also declared that innovational teaching methods had been very slow in developing. The assets available through MES should produce newer instructional methods to meet the problems faced in disadvantaged areas. A few of those interviewed expressed disappointment over the program's failure to attract outstanding teachers from other schools in the city.

Among the suggestions that the superintendents offered for strengthening the program, the one that was stressed was improvement of teacher-training programs--not only for this program, but for all schools. Better pre-teaching planning by teacher education institutions was one proposal. So far as MES specifically is concerned, the superintendents agreed that although time and opportunity for in-service training by local supervisors were provided, greater opportunity for in-service training by local supervisors during the regular school day is needed. In-depth discussions of the MES philosophy, and creative investigation and development of newer teaching methods were suggested as integral parts of teacher training.

Most of the superintendents urged that the program be expanded, but under control, while giving consideration to the present over-crowding in many areas of the city. They explained that under no circumstances should schools be designated for the MES program unless all requirements are met.

As a final suggestion, several superintendents proposed that their district offices should have control over the personnel of ME schools in order to strengthen community relations through the assignment and adjustment of the school staff.

SECTION V

OVERALL EVALUATION, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 13

OVERALL EVALUATION

The More Effective Schools Program has created schools which, in general, are more effective in teaching children in disadvantaged areas. This was the conclusion of the evaluators after they had collected, analyzed and interpreted data and had completed the interviews and observations detailed in the previous chapters. The present chapter outlines the strengths and weaknesses as the evaluators saw them.

In general, the small classes, heterogeneous grouping, relatively large staff, and abundant supplies made up an effective "new design for education" (to quote the aim of the program planners) that cannot be fully appreciated solely by examining the pupils' test scores in basic academic skills. Such positive gains as a liking for school and learning, increased self-esteem, respect for others, and improved ability to work harmoniously in groups were noted as direct results of the MES methods. At the same time, the failure of the program to bring about steadily higher achievement in the fundamental skills of reading and arithmetic as the pupils progress through the middle grades in elementary school was revealed. This seemed to the evaluators to reflect ineffective use of the program's resources and modern instructional techniques. This, in turn, may have been caused by the inexperience or inadequate training of many of the teachers.

On the whole, the major objectives of the program were realized. The aims of maximum integration and utilization of the school plants until 6 p.m. on school days, as well as during weekends and in summer, however, appear to have been unrealistic. The goal of close relations with local colleges and universities was reached, where it was reached at all, more by the accident of geography than by careful planning. Thus, where a school was conveniently located for student-teachers, the relations were close, but otherwise this phase of the program was little implemented.

Problems of Evaluation

Matching of ME and Control Schools

Although ME and control schools had been well matched when first paired with each other, this was not always the case by 1969. In one instance, although the neighborhoods served by a pair of schools are superficially similar, the control school of the pair is so close to a university school of education that it has many aspects of the typical "university school" with an abundance of student teachers, special summer programs funded by Brandeis and other universities, first-grade classes smaller than those of any ME school, additional teachers in the second grade for reading instruction, a full-time teacher trainer, extra above-quota teachers, and a student body from a somewhat higher socio-economic level than the other schools for which data are presented here. Furthermore, although the ethnic backgrounds of these schools appear to be similar at first glance, both having nearly two-thirds of the students from Spanish language backgrounds, the ME school reported that 52.6% of the pupils were having difficulty with English, while only 34.6% were so handicapped in the control school. In the ME school, virtually all of the children from Spanish-speaking homes were Puerto Ricans. In the control school, one-third of them were from other Spanish language backgrounds, which are usually higher in the socio-economic scale.

Two other schools were more closely matched ethnically in 1965 and 1966 than in 1968 and 1969. The most striking change was the ME school had gained in the proportion of "others", while the control school had increased its percentages of Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

In another case, although the ME and the control schools are well matched ethnically, a considerable proportion of the pupils in the control school now come from a middle-income housing development, while the ME school still serves a disadvantaged area.

Because of differences in the pupil population, it was possible for the control school in another pair to have two classes for intellectually gifted children.

Two other matched schools, located only one city block apart, seem to have populations which differ in social orientation, although they are ethnically similar. The efforts of the ME school staff members seem to be somewhat hampered by conflicting community pressures.

Another set of schools, although originally matched, can no longer be considered so because not only has the similarity of the communities changed, but also because the population growth in the neighborhood has caused the ME school to depart from the program guidelines. As a result, this school could not be regarded as a full-fledged ME school.

Adherence to Guidelines

In the evaluators' opinion, a school should not be given MES classification unless it establishes and maintains the full implementation of the program's guidelines. As mentioned before, general overcrowding in a certain district caused one of the schools to depart from the MES guidelines. As a result, a true evaluation of the program's effectiveness in that school could not be made.

It is suggested that a school in a crisis situation should be suspended from the program temporarily, if assessment of the facts involved warrant that action. Such a school should not be included in the evaluation coverage.

Availability of Data

Lack of a centralized cumulative data system for the MES program was found to be something of a handicap in making the evaluation. While the necessary information about pupils, staff, and schools is available, it is not always readily accessible. The result was a certain amount of duplication of effort, and in some instances disproportionate effort, by the evaluators.

Detailed Evaluative Judgments

An evaluation of the program in its various categories is presented below. This section opens with a discussion of how the More Effective Schools were staffed and administered, and then proceeds to take up the effects of the teachers' experience, training, methods, and mobility. This is followed by an analysis of the instructional program, including such aspects as the way children were grouped in their classes, the teaching techniques employed, and the utilization of the specialists. The section concludes with our appraisal of the amount of parental and community involvement that was obtained.

Administration and Staff Selection

In the opinion of the evaluators, the central staff of MES was capable and energetic, but it was too small for the manifold duties and responsibilities it had to shoulder. The coordination and supervision of services in such a multi-faceted enterprise as this were hampered at times because the efforts of the project director and program aides had to be spread over too wide a front.

At the next level of administration, district superintendents and school principals apparently had not always been informed about decisions or directives in time to put them into effect. The superintendents and principals themselves commented on this as a flaw in the program. This may have been caused in part by the heavy work load placed on the central staff.

Each of the 18 ME schools had staff members serving as administrative assistants, but none of the eight control schools had anyone serving in that role. Seventeen of the 18 ME schools had at least three assistant principals--which was more than in the control schools. Guidance and clinical services in the ME schools far outnumbered those in the control schools and in the city schools in general. This no doubt follows from the fact that the ME schools had more guidance and clinical staff members, and also more supportive personnel, than the other schools did. The MES secretarial staffs also were larger than those of the control schools.

While most of the MES personnel impressed the evaluators as being generally enthusiastic and dedicated, some of the administrative and specialist staff members sometimes seemed to lack the warmth of personality and interest in the program that was one of the factors clearly responsible for its success. The relative scarcity of Negro and Puerto Rican staff members was evident, although the evaluators judged that, other qualifications being equal, the staff members who could identify with the ethnic, cultural, and language backgrounds of the students were more successful in the classroom and in relations with parents and the community. In general, principals and supervisors whose backgrounds matched that of the community had a distinct advantage in communicating with that community. Some schools where this was not the case, however, seemed to be among the most effective.

In the evaluators' opinion, selection of personnel for the MES Program might be improved through increased contacts with the colleges of education throughout the New York Metropolitan Area. This might also lead to recruiting more student teachers for ME schools that have had few or none in the past.

The Teaching Staff

The evaluators judged the MES teachers to be generally skilled professionally and to have mastered the subjects they taught, but young and unprepared for the methods required for teaching in an urban community or in an innovative program. As reported in Chapter 9, about two-thirds of the teachers had had less than five years of teaching experience, and half less than three years. The combination of inexperience and lack of training for the special opportunities in education offered by MES was the program's greatest weakness, in the view of the evaluators.

Although the occasions for in-service teacher training seemed numerous, the actual resources in many schools were insufficient to satisfy the needs. Many teachers reported that they would benefit from additional training. Some apparently did not realize that they were receiving training when it was in the nature of informal sessions, meetings with specialists or cluster teachers, or regular faculty meetings. Many teachers suggested that MES required specific training for the program itself.

The outstanding job of training carried out by some assistant principals was evident in some schools. Especially valuable were the exchanges of ideas among supervisors, specialists, and teachers, as well as teachers' visits to each other's classrooms, and demonstrations of good classroom procedures. Many young teachers in these schools thereby gained insight into instructional methods for heterogeneously grouped classes, use of audiovisual materials, and attitudes of minority groups.

Training provided on a centralized basis seemed to be limited to in-service orientation, some courses on curriculum, and workshop sessions on a district level. Special courses sponsored by outside agencies in some schools appeared to interest the staff keenly. The evaluators believe that more such courses and workshops would have benefited the program materially. In some schools, elaborate programs initiated at the beginning of the year seemed to compensate in part for the inexperience of teachers. These programs included orientation meetings, demonstration lessons, after-school workshops, inter-cultural seminars, and special conferences on the needs of pupils and the community.

The results of inadequate training and experience were seen in inefficient teaching procedures, unskilled lesson planning or preparation, failure to provide for the differences in reactions of children to new material, and lack of flexibility and creativity in guiding the learning process. Of course, it was more difficult to plan creative individual instruction in an ME school than in a conventional school, but, in the opinion of the evaluators, this was one of the challenges MES was called upon to meet.

A number of teachers seemed to be falling back upon commercial materials and workbooks, so that here and there the depth of instruction and enrichment did not seem to be as evident as in other ME schools.

Only a few instances of poor pupil attitude or poor rapport with the teacher were observed. Teachers showed little favoritism, and their respect for pupil opinions was obvious. Most of them were friendly, calm, sympathetic, and they shared the children's enthusiasms. These teachers seemed to win the pupils' quick acceptance of the tasks assigned, and inspired pride and enjoyment in learning. Some, however, tended to isolate themselves and to stress single subject areas instead of entering into the cooperative, team-spirit of teaching as suggested in the MES guidelines.

In several schools, the lack of staff experience suggested a need for a planned pattern of school control. The general tone of each school apparently reflected standards set by the administration. But in some, the appearance of the teacher did not seem to contribute to the pupils' application to study nor to desirable standards. The extremely relaxed attitudes and casual dress of some teachers perhaps were not conducive to academic striving on the part of the pupils.

The ME schools experienced little teacher mobility, except that caused by marriage, pregnancy, or moving. Teacher supply at the beginning of the year seemed to be excellent, and little difficulty was encountered in filling vacancies with beginning teachers. However, it was observed that more experienced teachers did not apply. Some schools also had trouble filling vacancies in the middle of the year. Others reported problems in getting substitute teachers.

As a group, teachers who had been trained in the Intensive Teacher Training Program did not seem to contribute very much to attainment of the MES goals. They were too weak, disinterested, inefficient, and poorly trained, according to the comments of supervisors and other teachers.

In the opinion of the evaluators, the ME schools as a whole, however, were characterized by a concerted effort of the principals, supervisors, teachers, specialists, and auxiliary staff members to carry out the program to the best of their ability. Furthermore, these efforts, despite the shortcomings mentioned, brought about desirable changes. These changes were apparent when the attitudes of the children and the emotional and social climates in these schools were compared with those in schools that did not have the advantage of the program.

Instructional Program

MES appeared to the evaluators to encourage experimentation and creativity among teachers and leadership among supervisors, although some principals said they thought that these schools were changing their teaching methods quite slowly. Every ME school was found to be making sincere and concentrated efforts in the areas of reading and the language arts. The MES program provided enough flexibility to allow several patterns of instruction to exist.

The administration in each ME school worked with the staff to set up the best program possible under local circumstances. They took into consideration the students, parents, staff, and the school plant. In each situation there could be found large-group instruction, small groups of students of like ability, and individualized reading instruction. The librarians had excellent rapport with the classes and with practically all staff members who assumed some responsibility for the language arts program. Emphasis on independent reading was heavy.

Especially impressive was the attention given to the spoken word. In small and large group situations, children were encouraged to speak at every opportunity, but not just with "yes" or "no" answers. They were required to respond in full sentences. Impressive, too, was the very fine work that was being done with children who had speech difficulties. Dramatics and other devices that called upon them for a verbal effort in a pleasurable situation gave them greater confidence.

The variety of activities in the classrooms impressed the evaluators. Although most of the instructional time was spent on the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic, the teachers introduced other extremely worthwhile learning experiences. These helped to promote self esteem, personal pride, the social graces, and respect for other persons, including the teachers.

At the same time, the attention to the basic skills might have been more fruitful if the teachers had been more experienced in the problems of their pupils or more fully trained in techniques for meeting these problems.

The evaluators also noticed in some schools a tendency to use "above-quota" teachers routinely and unimaginatively, rather than assigning them to roles that would best capitalize on their abilities. In a few classes, especially in the lower grades, children seemed to be confused and uncomfortable when they were exposed to too many different teachers too rapidly--perhaps two or three different specialists on the same subject in as many days. In some classes, the evaluators observed, traditional methods of instruction were used, especially in the higher grades.

In some ME schools, principals occasionally assigned specialist teachers to such tasks as lunchroom or bus duty, apparently on the theory that specialists should share in all the routines of the school so as to become integrated with the staff. This, however, seemed to be a waste of the specialists' talents, and it also created an unfortunate morale problem among the specialists.

Many positive aspects of excellent classroom instruction were encountered. The smaller classes and abundant materials permitted teachers to introduce activities that encouraged individualized student participation. Some teachers successfully helped pupils to develop leadership ability through such techniques as allowing children to direct various classroom activities--for example, calling on other children to recite.

Excellent display materials, designed as much to teach as to decorate, were frequently in evidence. Displays dealing with Negro and Puerto Rican history and culture were particularly impressive.

A much larger amount of creative writing was being done in the ME schools than in the control schools. In almost every class in the ME schools, for example, pupils wrote an essay about what they wanted to be. In one class, eight out of nineteen wanted to be teachers (perhaps elementary school is where a recruitment program should start), while three wanted to be policemen, four "store women," one a stewardess, one an artist, one a singer, and one "a beauty queen."

Children were permitted and encouraged to express themselves orally, to give their opinions on controversial topics, and were allowed to disagree when they had a sound conviction.

In the spring, plants were growing in abundance in the MES classrooms. Almost every room had a science program or corner, and a great many had some type of living animal that was being studied and cared for by the students. These items were believed to be of considerable value in promoting student desire to learn and joy in learning.

Another valuable factor in the success of the teaching program was the team planning fostered by the MES guidelines. These encouraged the staff to get to know each other on a professional basis, and therefore to cooperate in solving instructional problems.

Personal health and appearance, traffic safety, and community responsibility were emphasized by the teachers. The values of being friendly, courteous, well-dressed, clean, and self-reliant were discussed frequently in the classrooms and apparently with good effect. Teachers were quick to give rewards, not only orally, but by displaying pupil work and by posting wall charts recording outstanding work done by individual pupils in class or on projects.

In addition to small-group teaching in the skill subjects, project work by small clusters of youngsters was much in evidence. The children thus learned about a particular subject, and at the same time gained valuable experience in group endeavors.

Many children in disadvantaged areas are very talented in art, music, and dance. All the ME schools provided ample opportunity for them to develop these talents.

The evaluators observed that the growing foreign language segment of the New York City school population in disadvantaged areas, especially Spanish, and, to a lesser degree, French (from the West Indies), have posed problems for MES, as well as for all other schools in these neighborhoods. These problems derive not only from the children's inability to speak English, but from their reaction when plunged into the freedom of their new environment, which was so different from the highly controlled and disciplined social order in which they had been living.

The observers' ratings of the MES and control schools are summarized in Table 20.

Parent and Community Involvement

To a considerable extent, the participation of parents and leaders in the school's community was achieved. As might be expected, the participation was more effective in the guidance aspects of the program than in actual instruction or curriculum revision, although on this latter point, some desirable changes were aided by the community's involvement. In this connection, the evaluators reached the conclusion that constant and continued study of these communities, especially the problems and backgrounds of minorities, coupled with greater efforts to improve school-community relations, would probably be reflected in better academic work by the pupils.

The evaluators were impressed most favorably by some of the progress along these lines. One of the most effective examples was the "Conference Day" held on May 17 and described in Chapter 5. Where teachers, parents, and administrators could meet and exchange ideas and information on successes and failures in the teaching process, both the school and the community, as well as the pupils, seemed to benefit. The evaluators found that the parents and school personnel were eager for such exchanges.

In a majority of ME schools, visitors from the community were well received and given prompt attention. This was a positive factor in good community relations. However, in a few schools the non-professional administrative staff appeared to be inattentive and indifferent to members of the community.

TABLE 20

Percentage Distribution of Observers' Ratings of MES and Control Schools

	MES (92 Classes in 15 Schools)			Control Schools (28 Classes in 6 Schools)		
	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Above Average	Average	Below Average
Physical Conditions						
Space, lighting heat, ventilation	93	0	7	83	17	0
General appearance - classroom	86	13	1	79	18	3
General appearance - school	93	7	0	66.6	33.4	0
Supplies, equipment, books, maps, audio-visual	87	13	0	72	28	0
Teacher:						
Appearance and manner	98	2	0	93	7	0
Rapport with students	90	10	0	90	10	0
Maintenance of class interest	91	8	1	72	25	3
Extent of preparation	95	5	0	82	18	0
Knowledge of subject matter	98	2	0	93	7	0
Handling of discipline problems	95	4	1	75	22	3
Lesson:						
Overall quality	95	5	0	79	7	14
Degree of creativity	77	23	0	53	29	18
Depth of instruction	95	5	0	83	14	3
Articulation of previous, present, and future lessons	87	13	0	71	18	11
Building on experiences	90	9	1	64.5	21.5	14
Use of audio-visual materials	74	26	0	39	43	18
Students encouraged to explore on their own	83	17	0	60	40	0
Conscious effort to provide for individual differences	95	5	0	47	32	21
Homework meaningful	95	5	0	64	36	0
Students:						
Deportment	95	5	0	75	22	3
Motivation	91	9	0	75	22	3
Apparent familiarity with subject	92	8	0	69	25	6
Participation	99	1	0	65	29	6
Interest level	97	3	0	68	29	3

Implementation of the Guidelines

This section considers the extent of implementation of the MES guidelines, point by point. The evaluators base their opinions on the information that was collected from all the sources mentioned in Chapter 3. The findings are as follows, with the guideline quoted before the comment:

Pupils and Curriculum

1. Integration will be a major factor in the choice of schools for the More Effective Schools Program.

The schools chosen were attended mainly by Negro and Puerto Rican children, with a few exceptions, and were in predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican neighborhoods. The ethnic backgrounds of the students, as of the neighborhoods, has changed little since the MES program was launched. Integration, as apparently contemplated in the guidelines, remains far from realization, however. As can be seen in Table 9 in Chapter 9, "Recorded Data," four ME.schools are more than 90% Negro in their pupil enrollment and six are more than 50% Puerto Rican. In only four schools are more than 25% of the students in the "other" (meaning mainly white) category. Only one school, 307K, bussed pupils to the school for integration purposes.

2. The program will provide for education beginning at ages 3-4.

Although all the ME schools except one had pre-kindergarten classes, which include 4-year-olds, this guideline was followed to only a relatively limited extent. Lack of space prevented most of the schools from providing pre-kindergarten experience for any large proportion of the eligible children in the community served. No provision for education of 3-year-olds was apparent, and, as Table 3 indicates, the schools had only about half as many pre-kindergarten as kindergarten classes. The pre-kindergarten classes did not enroll half as many children as the kindergarten classes did, since the latter usually had 19 or 20 children, and the former only 15.

3. The school will be open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., with programs to meet the needs of the pupils.

Fifteen of the sixteen schools surveyed on this point had programs for pupils from 3 to 5 p.m. at least three days a week. Nine of these fifteen schools also scheduled programs during the hours from 7 to 10 p.m. The evaluators suggest that the guidelines should call for afternoon activities from 3 to 5 p.m., since 6 p.m. is unrealistic, especially during the winter when darkness falls by 5 p.m. or soon after.

4. Class size will vary from 15 in pre-kindergarten classes and 20 in kindergarten to a maximum of 22 in other grades.

In December, 1968, only one ME school exceeded the 15-pupil average in pre-kindergarten, and only two were above the 20-pupil average in kindergarten (Table 3). Furthermore, in the one school with a higher pre-kindergarten average, this fell below 15 by June. While Table 2 shows that average class size in grades 1 through 6 was 20.2 in December, 1968, some MES classes were larger than 22 in scattered instances. This was attributable chiefly to pupil mobility and changes in neighborhood housing patterns, and probably this occasional deviation from the guidelines is inevitable. By June, 1969, only 51 of 649 classes in grades 1 through 6 (7.8%) had registers higher than 22.

5. Classes will include children with a wide range of abilities and personality traits, heterogeneously grouped. Individualized instruction in the 3Rs will be provided for through flexible grouping.

This guideline was fully implemented. Through interviews and observations, the evaluators found that students in all ME schools were heterogeneously grouped. In each classroom, individualized instruction was given, and small-group work was also provided for a few pupils who had been homogeneously selected. These small groups were especially common in the areas of reading and arithmetic. Additionally, several schools also arranged other small groups for children with language difficulties. Ethnic background and other characteristics such as age and sex apparently were not taken into account in forming the groups. Special problems were handled by guidance classes, reading specialists, and other specialists.

6. Promising modern teaching methods will be implemented under optimum conditions. These will include team teaching and non-graded blocs consisting of early childhood grades, grades 3-4, and 5-6.

According to the questionnaires completed by the teachers, half of them did some team teaching, 30% of them quite often. Only about one in ten of those who used it at all reported that they found it ineffective. According to the principals, several ME schools had non-graded blocs that included more than one standard grade level. Appropriateness of instructional aids and techniques was observed in each of the ME schools. In the opinion of the evaluators, the chief handicap in effecting this guideline, so far as optimum conditions of teaching are concerned, is the teachers' lack of training or experience in using modern methods.

7. Abundant supplies of modern teaching materials appropriate to urban communities will be necessary.

According to the evaluators' rating of the 92 MES classes they observed (Table 20), 87% were "above average" in their equipment, books, maps audiovisual materials, and other supplies. A conscious effort had been made to furnish items that dealt with understanding the ethnic backgrounds of pupils and the community.

8. Provision will be made to meet the needs of children with physical, emotional, and social problems through a teacher, guidance and medical team.

Teachers and guidance counselors need a more coordinated team effort than apparently has been possible in most situations if they are to treat each pupil on an individual basis in terms of the problems mentioned in the guideline. The principals generally were positive in assessing the effectiveness of the team members and the need for their services.

9. Efforts will be made to overcome the effects of pupil and family mobility through closer cooperation with the Department of Housing, the Department of Welfare, and other social agencies. In addition, adjustments will be made in the present transfer regulations to encourage pupils to remain in their schools.

The community coordinators and family workers in most schools tried to deal with the problem of family mobility by holding individual conferences with the parents. Table 6 shows that while the mobility rate in most ME schools was fairly high, it tended to be lower than in the control schools. Most principals said they had no real control over the mobility rate, but 16 out of 18 reported that some progress had been made in decreasing it. A further indication of MES holding power was that instances were found where parents had falsified their addresses to keep their children in an ME school. In several schools, liaisons had been established with the Department of Housing and the Department of Welfare for the purpose of maintaining the stability of their registers.

10. Close relations will be established with local colleges and universities for purposes of teacher training, curriculum development, research, and evaluation and project development.

Thirteen of the MES principals reported that their schools maintained such relationships for teacher training. About one-third of the schools carried on project development with colleges. Only two MES principals mentioned cooperative efforts in curriculum development, and only three cited research and evaluation as activities facilitated through working with a local college or university.

11. Maximum use will be made of the newest techniques in audio-visual instruction, including closed circuit T.V.

The evaluators rated three-fourths of the classes they observed as "above average" in the use of audio-visual materials (Table 20). Only a small number of the classes observed had closed circuit T.V., however.

12. Teacher specialists in art, music, and other curriculum areas will be used to enrich the instructional program.

Table 11 shows that MES employed a large number of teachers specializing in a variety of fields. All of the schools had specialists in music and library. Except for the school which has only pre-kindergarten through second grade, all had junior guidance specialists. All but four had speech-improvement teachers, eight had reading-improvement teachers, and 13 had corrective-reading teachers. All except three had health-education instructors.

Personnel

1. Efforts will be made to recruit a staff which is enthusiastic, able, and committed to the program. This will be achieved through the democratic involvement of teachers and supervisors.

Most of the principals worked diligently on recruitment and involved their staffs in their search for appropriate personnel. Additional centralized effort should be made, however, to recruit larger numbers of qualified teachers who are committed to these communities and the MES program.

2. Provision will be made for a continuous program of professional growth, including payment by the Board of Education for one college course per semester.

Although most schools made a conscientious effort to provide teacher orientation, demonstration teaching, and teacher-training sessions, the evaluators found no evidence that the Board of Education had paid for any college courses for MES staff members. In the evaluators' judgment, a strengthened program of professional development would greatly improve MES.

3. In order to give teachers maximum time for concentration on instruction, teachers will receive a daily unassigned preparation period, and relief from all non-teaching duties.

Apparently every effort was made to have cluster teachers and specialists provide coverage of classes so that most MES classroom teachers had a daily unassigned period. Relief from non-teaching duties was fairly well accomplished, but it was not universal. Six MES principals reported that this objective had been realized almost entirely, and eight others said that this part of the guideline had been followed substantially.

School Plant and Organization

1. Maximum use of the school plant will be made for a full school day, weekends and during the summer months.

In addition to the regular full school-day program and activities from 3 to 5 p.m. (see guideline #3 under Pupils and Curriculum), at least 14 ME schools had summer programs, but only two reported use of the building and grounds on Saturdays and Sundays.

2. Facilities will be sought for outside the regular school plant, in office buildings, settlement houses, etc.

Five MES principals indicated a need for more space for neighborhood classes than their regular school plants afforded. Another five expressed a desire for more room for non-classroom activities, and one said he needed a meeting area. No evidence was found to indicate that additional office buildings or settlement houses were being used as school facilities.

3. Schools will be located so as to achieve maximum integration.

See guideline 1 under Pupils and Curriculum.

Community Relations

1. Each school will have a Community Relations Expert to promote good human relations among the children, the staff, and the community.

Sixteen ME schools reported that they employed a community relations coordinator. These experts, as observed by the evaluators, were generally doing an excellent job of promoting good human relations among the children, the parents, the staff, and the community.

2. Wide and sustained community involvement will be encouraged through the parent associations, parent workshops, and community organizations.

Because of the teacher strike in the fall and its repercussions, relations with the community were strained in most MES neighborhoods during the early part of the school year, but they began to improve subsequently. More parents participated in parent workshops than in parent association activities. The MES Parent Council was particularly effective in coordinating school-community activities and in arousing interest and pride in MES.

CHAPTER 14

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation of the More Effective Schools has reflected several points of view. Some are dominated by the program's accomplishments, and others by its weaknesses. Just which of them are most in evidence in any single section of the report depends upon the particular aspect of the program that was being examined, and through whose eyes it was being seen. The aim of this chapter is to present a composite picture, with pros and cons in proper perspective. On balance, that picture reveals the positive outweighing the negative in each of the ME schools.

Thanks to their relatively large, enthusiastic staffs of both classroom and special teachers, these schools were able to make good use of their supplies and equipment. Such techniques as cluster teaching, small-group instruction, and individualized instruction were widely applied. Yet, optimum results were not always obtained, principally because many of the teachers were relatively young and inexperienced, as was also the case in most control schools. A need for better training in these techniques was expressed not only by teachers, but by their principals and district superintendents as well. The evaluators regard the teachers' inexperience and their need for additional training as the major weakness of the program, leading to frustration and confusion in a few instances and also some loss of the full advantages of the program's additional staff and plentiful materials. The weakness was partly overcome in many schools through the efforts of the administrative and supervisory staffs to raise the standards of instruction.

Mobility of pupils prevented those who moved from school to school, whether from an ME school to another or vice versa, from benefitting from the continuous impact of the program. This also interrupted the smoothness of teaching in many classes. Mobility was decreased to some extent by parents who falsified their addresses in order to keep their children in an ME school.

Most of the ME schools placed heavy emphasis upon developing strong relations with the community through community coordinators, family workers, guidance counselors, administrators, and parent associations. While many principals and supervisors wanted even more community participation, this aspect of the ME schools seemed superior to the progress that other schools were making in this area.

Accomplishments

One of the basic accomplishments of the program was the enthusiasm that it aroused among almost everyone who was exposed to it or connected with it--administrative and teaching staff, pupils, parents, and members of the community in general. Perhaps this also led to higher expectations than could be realized.

The evaluators saw many indications that instruction was made more meaningful and pertinent to the lives of the children, who seemed to gain greater realization of their personal worth. One teacher, for example, emphasized that the program influenced pupil behavior by fostering a sense of accomplishment, the feeling of greater dignity, self-respect, and a desire to learn and remain in school.

Academic progress in the basic skills of reading and arithmetic was judged to have advanced materially through Grade 3, but slower in the higher grades--the latter fact also holding for the control schools. Increased pupil interest in learning and a more positive attitude toward school in general was universal among the ME schools. The high staff morale and close staff relationships made treatment of children's learning and adjustment problems a total-school function, rather than leaving this to individuals and separate units in the school.

Results of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, administered in the spring to MES fifth-grade students who had also taken the tests in the third grade at the same schools, showed that the average grade equivalent scores of these children were as follows: Word Knowledge, 5.7, equal to the national norm, which schools in disadvantaged areas usually do not reach in any aspect of academic achievement; Reading, 5.0; Arithmetic Computation, 5.3; Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts, 5.1. The fifth-grade test results for the eight matched pairs of ME and control schools placed the ME schools two months ahead in Word Knowledge, control schools one month ahead in Reading and Arithmetic Computation, and ME and control schools equal in Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts.

When these MES fifth-graders in the paired schools had taken the tests two years earlier, their average scores had been ahead of the control schools average on all four subtests--five months in Word Knowledge, four months in Reading, one month in Arithmetic, and two months in Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts. Making allowances for the many factors that call for caution in interpreting test results, it appears that MES pupils made more rapid progress in early grades and less rapid progress later, especially in learning to understand reading passages and to reason, as compared to learning a fundamental vocabulary and basic arithmetic.

These conclusions are supported by a comparison of Word Knowledge and Reading test scores of a small group of students who had been in the matched schools as fifth-graders two years before and were now together in one of two junior high schools as seventh-graders. The sample group of 43 seventh-grade ME students had Word Knowledge and Reading grade equivalent average scores of 6.0 and 5.7, respectively, as compared with 5.5 and 5.2 for the sample of 83 control-school students. The five-month lead of the ME students over the controls on both subtests represented a decrement of 4 school months from the nine-month margin of superiority that they had registered two years previously in the fifth grade, however. Evidently the change to the junior high school caused the MES students to lose ground, but they nevertheless maintained some of their lead over the control students in the seventh grade.

Additional second-grade data on Word Knowledge and Reading, supplied for some children in the paired ME and control schools, also indicated a considerable margin of superiority for ME schools in the early grades. Their average Reading score was the same as the control school average in the second grade, but was five months ahead in the third. These MES students held one month of that lead in the fifth grade. In Word Knowledge, the MES pupils led the controls by one month in average score in the second grade, by seven months in the third grade, and by six months in the fifth grade.

Other statistical data brought out these facts about MES, as compared to control schools:

Enrollment in the ME schools was generally smaller--a maximum of 1,391, as against 2,735 for the largest control school--and so was class size, averaging 20.2 for ME schools and 26.0 for control schools. Per capita pupil costs averaged $972 in ME schools, which was an increase of 21% in two years, and $599 in control schools, up 44% in the same period. Pupil mobility was fairly high, and about the same, in both types of schools, although in the last three years it had not increased as much in the ME schools as in control schools.

The ethnic background of students did not change very much in either type of school, remaining mostly Negro and Puerto Rican at all except one ME and one control school. The pedagogical personnel was predominantly white in all the schools, however, the lowest proportion (68%) being at one ME school in Manhattan.

The number of children with English-language difficulties varied widely among individual schools, but little between MES and control schools as groups. One ME school reported that no pupil had such a problem; another indicated that 83% did. The range at control schools was 1% to 46%. On length of teacher experience, little difference was reported--64% in MES and 65% in control schools had from one to five years of teaching experience.

Parent and community involvement far beyond that in other schools led the evaluators to the conclusion that no ME school was considered an entity in itself, but each was an integral part of the community. Even where the teachers' strike and other factors had aroused criticism of the school, the program turned the tide of community opinion.

The evaluators reported that the program's guidelines had been followed quite well, with only a few exceptions. These exceptions were: Integration apparently was not furthered, except for the results of bussing at one school. Education for 3-year-olds wasn't attempted at all as a part of the program. Efforts to overcome the effects of family and pupil mobility were made to some extent, but not through the agencies mentioned in the guidelines. The provision for continued professional growth of the staff through payment for one college course per semester was not implemented. Facilities outside the schools were not widely used. Curriculum development and research in cooperation with local colleges were not undertaken.

Recommendations

The evaluators offer the following recommendations for strengthening the MES program, without listing them in order of priority:

1. The project's central staff should be strengthened by adding administrative and supervisory personnel, with the necessary secretarial assistance, to permit greater coordination of services.

2. District superintendents and principals should be notified of all decisions and directives that affect MES before the decisions are enforced or the directives distributed.
3. Administrative and specialist staff members, as well as teachers, should be selected for MES with full consideration of warmth of personality, sincerity, and interest in the program.
4. Each principal should be advised that, within the guidelines, he is free to assign his teachers according to the needs of his school.
5. Without relaxing the standards or qualifications for teachers in MES, staff members should be selected who can identify with the ethnic, cultural, and language backgrounds of the pupils. The MES program should actively recruit qualified Negro and Puerto Rican personnel.
6. Special attention should be given to selecting a staff that can communicate with foreign-language students, most of them Spanish-speaking, but also some from the West Indies who speak French.
7. More of the program's "above-quota" teachers should be assigned for the purpose of grouping children within classes for special instruction in reading and mathematics.
8. Where pupils need the security of a relationship with a single teacher who knows them, reduce the number of subject-area specialists brought into the classroom.
9. The strongest recommendation urged is that, to a greater extent than in the past, teachers be given orientation to familiarize them with the program's objectives and with inner-city characteristics, and training that will enable them to take full advantage of MES's small classes, additional materials and equipment, and extra services. Two types of teacher-training are suggested as follows:
    a. Initiation of a special, intensive, centralized program that will give the necessary orientation and qualify the teachers, without cost to themselves, to use the small-group and individualized instructional techniques that are most effective in small, heterogeneous classes.
    b. Assignment of a special teacher-trainer to work with the assistant principals in each ME school so that teachers' instruction in the techniques mentioned will be continued and amplified.

10. ME schools should encourage teacher-education institutions in the metropolitan area to teach in their methods courses more of the techniques appropriate for MES. Additionally, these institutions should be urged to assign larger numbers of student-teachers to all ME schools, not just those conveniently located.

11. Firm guidelines should be established for the MES specialists' services so that, first, these will be a part of the total program, not a series of separate special services, and that, second, they will be evaluated continuously to ensure achievement of the program's objectives.

12. Serious consideration should be given to revising the guidelines so that unrealistic specifications are eliminated. Especially in need of modification are the guidelines on achieving integration, keeping the schools open for extracurricular activities until 6 p.m., implementing the objective of closer relations with local colleges for such purposes as curriculum development and research, and including 3-year-olds in the program (in the absence of facilities for doing so).

13. In the interest of greater precision in future evaluations, the matching of ME and control schools should be reassessed, especially where recent housing developments may have altered a neighborhood's character, to be sure that schools are properly paired. This reassessment should also determine that sufficient controls are established to make possible realistic comparisons with all ME schools.

14. Full data, cumulative for the whole MES program and available in a central office coordinated with city records, should be kept on magnetic tape for processing as needed for evaluation or other purposes.

15. If unavoidable overcrowding or other unforeseen factors prevent a school selected for the program from following the guidelines, that school should be temporarily suspended from the program until the guidelines can be met.

The evaluators strongly recommend that the MES program be continued and expanded. Since this program seems to have been most successful in creating a healthy climate for learning and in developing good student adjustment to education, and relatively less successful in raising the standards of reading and mathematics, increased efforts should be directed toward improving the organization and utilization of the excellent staff and facility resources to enhance student progress in these basic skills.

APPENDIX

Teacher Questionnaire

Student Questionnaire

Parent's Form

Professional Supportive Personnel Questionnaire

Paraprofessional's Questionnaire

The Psychological Corporation
304 East 45th Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

School Program
Evaluation

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME___________________________________

SCHOOL_________________________________

GRADE YOU TEACH_____ SPECIALTY (IF ANY)__________

Your answers to these questions are needed for a study of your school that is being made for the Board of Education. Please answer all the questions. Full consideration will be given to your answers in making recommendations for modifications and improvements in this program.

Please use a check mark to show your answer to each question.

1. Sex: 1___Male 2___Female

2. What is your highest educational degree?

1___Bachelor's
2___Master's
3___Doctorate
4___Other (Specify)__________

3. Including this year, how many years have you been teaching?

1___One
2___Two
3___Three
4___Four
5___Five
6___Six
7___Seven
8___Eight
9___Nine or more
(Specify)________

4. Including this year, how many years have you been teaching in this school?

1___One
2___Two
3___Three
4___Four
5___Five
6___Six
7___Seven
8___Eight
9___Nine or more
(Specify)________

5. Have you received any in-service training in your school this year?

1___Yes
2___No

6. In your opinion, how helpful has been the in-service training in your school?

1___Very helpful
2___Fairly helpful
3___Not helpful at all
4___Don't know
5___No training has been provided

7. Have you helped to train other teachers in your school this year?

1___Yes
2___No

8. Is time reserved for faculty conferences during the school day?

1___Yes, on a regular basis
2___Yes, whenever necessary
3___No

9. Do you think that the curriculum in general is appropriate for the students in terms of their backgrounds, experiences, and needs?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Don't know

10. In your opinion, what is the overall quality of instruction in your school?

1___Excellent
2___Above average
3___Average
4___Below average
5___Don't know or no opinion

(ITEMS 11-24)

Below is a list of problems you may have met in your school. Please rate the severity of each by placing the appropriate code number after each of the item numbers.

Code: 1 = No problem
2 = Slight problem
3 = Serious problem
4 = Not applicable or don't know

11___Students' behavior
12___Students' motivation
13___Students' ability
14___Size of classrooms
15___Classroom facilities
16___Obtaining materials and supplies (other than audio-visual)
17___Obtaining audio-visual materials and equipment
18___Getting assistance from teacher aides
19___Getting assistance from guidance personnel
20___Getting assistance from supportive services
21___Clerical and other non-teaching duties
22___Relations with staff members
23___Relations with parents
24___Relations with community

25. What is your opinion of the size of your class group?

1___Too large
2___About right
3___Too small

(ITEMS 26-29)

For the following, indicate the extent of use and the effectiveness of each in your class this year by entering one of the following code numbers:

Code: 1 = Used often and effectively
2 = Used often, but ineffectively
3 = Used occasionally and effectively
4 = Used occasionally, but ineffectively
5 = Never, or hardly ever, used

26___Cluster teaching
27___Team teaching
28___Small-group instruction
29___Individualized instruction

(ITEMS 30-36)

Below is a list of various types of personnel that might be available in your school. Use the following code to indicate how useful each has been to your class during this school year:

Code: 1 = Very useful
2 = Somewhat useful
3 = Not useful
4 = Available, but not used
5 = Not available

30___Teacher specialists (e.g., remedial reading, music, art)
31___Teacher aides
32___Guidance counselors
33___Social workers
34___Psychologists
35___Doctors and nurses
36___Dental personnel

37. In general, what is your opinion about the amount of help you are getting for your classroom work?

1___Have more than needed
2___Have about the right amount
3___Haven't enough help

38. How responsive are parents to communications you send home with students?

1___Very responsive
2___Responsive
3___Unresponsive

39. In your opinion, does your school stimulate parents' interest in the intellectual and emotional growth of their children?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Not sure
4___No opinion

40. Do you plan to teach in this school next year?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Haven't decided

41. If a teacher who is a friend of yours were considering working in this school next year, would you offer encouragement?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Not sure
Comment (optional):___________

____

(ITEMS 42-46)
Listed below are various relationships that might affect your role in your school. Please give your appraisal of each of these relationships by writing in one of the following code numbers:

Code: 1 = Excellent
2 = Good
3 = Fair
4 = Poor
5 = Very poor
6 = No opinion

Relationship between:

42___Teachers and other staff members
43___Teachers and students
44___Teachers and parents
45___Teachers and counselors
46___School personnel and outside referral agencies

(ITEMS 47-53)
Please indicate your opinion of the main trend of change in your school in each of the areas listed below. Use the following code:

Code: 1 = Improving substantially (or maintaining excellence)
2 = Improving slightly
3 = Little or no change
4 = Getting a little worse
5 = No opinion

47___Students' rate of learning in reading and other language skills
48___Students' rate of learning in arithmetic
49___Students' academic development in general
50___Students' attitudes toward school
51___Students' social-emotional development and self-image
52___Parents' interest and involvement in school affairs
53___School-community relationships

54. What suggestions or recommendations can you offer for improving this school next year?

55. Additional comments (optional):

The Psychological Corporation
304 East 45th Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

School Program
Evaluation

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

YOUR NAME____

SCHOOL______________________ GRADE_____ CLASS_____

Your answers to these questions are needed for a study of your school that is being made for the Board of Education. PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. If you want to change an answer, you may erase.

(ITEMS 1-4)
Put an "X" in front of the answer you choose for each of the following questions:

1. How long have you been in this school?

1___One year or less
2___Two years
3___Three years
4___Four years
5___Five years or more

2. Do you like school more this year than you did last year?

1___Much more
2___A little more
3___About the same
4___Not as much
5___Much less

3. How often does your teacher give you extra help when you need it?

1___Very often
2___Sometimes
3___Only once in a while
4___Never

4. How often do you talk to your parents about what you do in school?

1___Very often
2___Sometimes
3___Only once in a while
4___Never

(ITEMS 5-20)
Show your answers to the following questions by putting an "X" in one of the boxes after them.

	(1) Yes	(2) No	(3) Not Sure
Do you think you are getting all the help you need in the following skills?			
5. Reading			
6. Writing			
7. Speaking			
8. Arithmetic			
9. Social Studies			
10. Science			
11. Is most of the homework you get a waste of time?			
12. Will going to school help you get a job when you grow up?			
13. Do you have an idea of what kind of work you want to do when you grow up?			
14. Do you know what kind of work your parents want you to do?			
15. Do you think you will be able to get the kind of job you want when you grow up?			

	(1) Yes	(2) No	(3) Not Sure
16. Do you think your school is better than other schools?			
17. Do your parents think your school is better than other schools?			
18. Do your friends think your school is better than other schools?			
19. Do you understand most of the things your teacher talks about?			
20. Do you like school more now than you used to?			

(ITEMS 21-32)
Below are some things you could say about yourself. Show how well they describe you by marking an "X" in one of the boxes in each row.

	(1) Not at All	(2) Only a Little	(3) Very Well
21. I respect other people			
22. I respect other people's property			
23. I do things by myself			
24. I do my school work			
25. I study my lessons			
26. I spend my extra time wisely			
27. I help others in need			
28. I join school activities			
29. I join activities outside of school			
30. I do my work even when I don't like to do it			
31. I answer questions in class			
32. I ask questions in class			

(ITEMS 33-42)
Below are listed some things that you may be either happy or unhappy about or have no feeling about. For each item, put an "X" in one of the boxes to show how you feel.

	(1) Happy	(2) Unhappy	(3) No Feeling
33. The way you are being taught in school			
34. How you are marked or graded by your teacher			
35. The way you get along with your classmates			
36. The way you get along with your teachers			
37. The way you get along with your parents			
38. How you make friends in school			
39. The neighborhood you live in			
40. The kind of person you are			
41. How well you read			
42. How well you do in school			

43. What extra attention are you getting to make you a better student?

____

____

____

____

44. What other things would you like to tell us about your school?

____

____

____

____

The Psychological Corporation
304 East 45th Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

PARENT'S FORM

School Program
Evaluation

THIS FORM IS TO BE ANSWERED BY THE MOTHER OF THE PUPIL (OR FATHER, RELATIVE, OR GUARDIAN CLOSEST TO THE CHILD).

CHILD'S NAME________________________________ GRADE______

YOUR RELATION TO CHILD____________ SCHOOL________________

Your answers to these questions are needed for a study of your child's school that is being made for the Board of Education.

Please answer these questions about the child and school named above. Answer all questions. If you want to change an answer, you may erase. When you have finished this form, please return it to the teacher.

---

1. How long has your child been in this school?

__1 year or less
__2 years
__3 years
__4 years
__5 years or more

2. How often do you visit your child's school?

1__Every day, or almost every day
2__Often
3__Once in a while
4__Never

3. How many times have you gone to Parent Association meetings this year?

__None
__1 or 2 times
__3 or 4 times
__5 or 6 times
__7 or 8 times
__9 or more times

For this next part, mark an "X" in the box to show which things are true or false about your child's school:

	(1) True	(2) False	(3) Don't Know
4. The principal, teachers, and other staff members are helpful and friendly.			
5. The principal runs the school well.			
6. The building is neat, clean, and comfortable.			
7. Things that the children have made are in the hallway or where they can be seen.			
8. The children are well behaved.			
9. The school has Pre-Kindergarten classes.			
10. The classes have about the right number of children in them.			
11. The teachers have people to help them in the classroom and to help pupils with problems.			
12. Each class has at least one extra teacher to help with the teaching.			

For these next items, mark an "X" in the box to show if your child has improved during the school year:

	(1) Yes	(2) No	(3) Don't Know
13. Reading			
14. Arithmetic			
15. Vocabulary			
16. Speaking			
17. Getting along with the teacher			
18. Getting along with classmates			
19. Getting along with the family			
20. Having more respect for others			
21. Being interested in school			
22. Talking about school work			
23. Wanting to look at magazines and books			
24. Planning what he wants to be when he (or she) grows up			

25. Is this school better or worse than other public schools in your area?

1___Better
2___About the same
3___Worse
4___Don't know

Does this school offer any of the following services to your child? (Check one or more.)

26___Help with personal problems
27___Extra help with school work
28___Other

29. Is your child getting any extra health services?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Don't know

30. Does your child's school encourage you to take part in school activities?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Don't know

31. Has anyone from the school ever visited you?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Don't know

32. What could be done to make this school better?

33. Additional comments (optional):

The Psychological Corporation
304 East 45th Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

PROFESSIONAL SUPPORTIVE PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

School Program
Evaluation

NAME____

SCHOOL______________________________________

Your answers to these questions are needed for a study of your school that is being made for the Board of Education. Please answer all the questions. Full consideration will be given to your answers in making recommendations for modifications and improvements in this program.

Please use a check mark to show your answer to each question.

1. Sex: 1___Male 2___Female

2. Which one of the following categories best describes your present position?

1___Supervisor
2___Guidance counselor
3___Psychologist
4___Psychiatrist
5___Social worker
6___Special teacher
(Specify)________________
7___Other (Specify)________________
____

3. What is your highest educational degree?

1___Bachelor's
2___Master's
3___Doctorate
4___Other (Specify)________________

4. What is your current professional status?

1___New York City License
2___New York State License
3___Not licensed or certified, but graduate of approved training program
4___New York City Certificate
5___Other (Specify)________________
____

5. How many years, including this one, have you been practicing your specialty in this school?

1___One
2___Two
3___Three
4___Four
5___Five
6___Six
7___Seven
8___Eight
9___Nine or more
(Specify)______

6. About how many students do you directly serve during an average week?

1___None
2___One to five
3___Six to ten
4___Eleven to twenty
5___Twenty-one to thirty
6___Thirty-one to forty
7___Over forty (Specify)__________

7. How adequate is the working space that is available to you for performing your services?

1___Very adequate
2___Adequate
3___Inadequate
4___Very inadequate

8. How adequate is the equipment that is available to you for performing your services?

1___Very adequate
2___Adequate
3___Inadequate
4___Very inadequate

(ITEMS 9-13)
Listed below are various relationships that might affect your role in your school. Please give your appraisal of each of these relationships by writing in one of the following code numbers:

Code: 1 = Excellent
2 = Good
3 = Fair
4 = Poor
5 = Very poor
6 = No opinion

9___With other staff members
10___With students
11___With parents
12___With community members
13___With outside referral agencies

14. How responsive are parents to communications you send home with students?

1___Very responsive
2___Responsive
3___Unresponsive
4___Does not apply

15. Do you feel parents become more interested in the intellectual development, emotional growth, and health needs of their children as a result of this school's influence?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Not sure
Comments (optional):__________
____

16. In general, how would you describe the students' attitude toward your school?

1___Excellent
2___Good
3___Fair
4___Poor
5___Very poor
6___No opinion or don't know
Comment (optional)__________
____

(ITEMS 17-23)
Please indicate your opinion of the main trend of change in your school in each of the areas listed below. Use the following code:

Code: 1 = Improving substantially (or maintaining excellence)
2 = Improving slightly
3 = Little or no change
4 = Getting a little worse
5 = No opinion

17___Students' rate of learning in reading and other language skills
18___Students' rate of learning in arithmetic
19___Students' academic development in general
20___Students' attitudes toward school
21___Students' social-emotional development and self-image
22___Parents' interest and involvement in school affairs
23___School-community relationships

24. Do you plan to continue in your position at this school next year?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Haven't decided

25. If a friend of yours were considering working in this school next year, would you offer encouragement?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Not sure
Comments (optional):__________
____
____

26. What suggestions or recommendations can you offer for improving this school next year?

____
____
____
____
____
____

The Psychological Corporation
304 East 45th Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

School Program
Evaluation

PARAPROFESSIONAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

THIS FORM IS TO BE ANSWERED BY TEACHER AIDES, FAMILY WORKERS, AND FAMILY ASSISTANTS

NAME______________________________ SCHOOL______

SEX: MALE________ FEMALE________

Your answers to these questions are needed for a study of your school that is being made for the Board of Education. Please answer all the questions.

Please use a check mark to show your answer to each question.

1. What is your job in the school?

1___Teacher Aide or Assistant
2___Family Worker
3___Family Assistant
4___Other (Specify)________________

2. What is your highest level of education?

1___Grade school
2___Attended high school
3___Finished high school
4___College courses
5___Other (Specify)________________

3. Including this year, how long have you been working in this school?

1___One year or less
2___Two years
3___Three years
4___Four years
5___Five years or more

What are some of the good features of this school? (Check as many of the following as apply.)

4___School building and equipment
5___Administrative staff
6___Teachers
7___Specialists
8___Guidance
9___Relations with parents and the community
10___Other______________________________

(ITEMS 11-36)
Please check each of the duties that you perform for this school:

11___Help with supplies, materials, and equipment
12___Prepare the room for activities
13___Assist with lunches and snacks
14___Help with clean-up
15___Arrange pictures on walls and bulletin boards

16___Help children with clothing and other personal needs
17___Help with outdoor play
18___Go with children on trips
19___Accompany children to and from school

20___Help with disciplinary problems
21___Help children who have reading problems
22___Help to teach children

23___Use foreign language with children
24___Use foreign language with parents
25___Use foreign language as an interpreter for other paraprofessionals and staff members

26___Identify special needs of the children for counselors or social workers
27___Talk with parents about their children
28___Meet parents at the school
29___Prepare lists of agencies that might be helpful to parents or the school
30___Accompany parents and children on visits to outside agencies for special help
31___Visit students' homes

32___Do clerical work
33___Help in registering Pre-Kindergarten children

34___Follow up absences
35___Keep a record of daily activities
36___Other (Specify)____________________
____

37. Do you feel that the school is making good use of your abilities?

1___Yes
2___No
3___Not sure

38. What kinds of additional work do you think you could do for the school?

____
____
____
____

52. What could be done to make this school better?

53. Additional comments (optional):

(ITEMS 39-51)

Please give a general rating of the children in your school by putting an "X" in one of the boxes in each of the rows below:

	(1) Excellent	(2) Good	(3) Fair	(4) Poor	(5) Very Poor
39. Getting along with classmates					
40. Getting along with the teacher					
41. Showing interest in school work					
42. Showing interest in learning					
43. Following directions					
44. Joining in class activities					
45. Joining in class discussions					
46. Being self-confident					
47. Behaving in school					
48. Keeping neat and clean					
49. Taking responsibility					
50. Taking pride in themselves					
51. Being proud of their school					